

INTELLECTUAL AND POLITICAL HISTORY



Antoni Grabowski

The Construction of Ottonian Kingship

Narratives and Myth
in Tenth-Century Germany

Amsterdam
University
Press

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

The Construction of Ottonian Kingship

The Construction of Ottonian Kingship

Narratives and Myth in Tenth-Century Germany

Antoni Grabowski

Amsterdam University Press

Cover illustration: Interior of Collegiate Church of Quedlinburg

Source: NoRud / Wikimedia Commons [CC BY-SA 3.0 de (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/de/deed.en>)

Cover design: Coördesign, Leiden

Lay-out: Crius Group, Hulshout

ISBN 978 94 6298 723 4

e-ISBN 978 90 4853 873 7 (pdf)

DOI 10.5117/9789462987234

NUR 684

© Antoni Grabowski / Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam 2018

All rights reserved. Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, no part of this book may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the written permission of both the copyright owner and the author of the book.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	7
Note on Citations	9
Introduction	11
1 Aims and State of the Art	12
2 What is Myth/Mythology?	15
3 Liudprand's Biography	19
4 Origins of <i>Antapodosis</i>	23
5 Language of <i>Antapodosis</i>	27
6 Other Contemporary Sources: Widukind's <i>Res gestae saxoni-</i> <i>cae; Continuation of the Chronicle of Regino of Prüm; Hrotsvit's</i> <i>Gesta Ottonis</i>	29
7 Interpreter of Liudprand: Frutolf of Michelsberg	30
8 Understanding Liudprand's Works: Textbooks	31

Part I The Making of a King

1 Henry I at Fritzlar 919	47
The Beginning of a New Dynasty	
1 King's Designation	47
2 <i>Rex Renitens</i>	66
2 Otto I at Aachen 936	85
A Successor – Continuator	
1 Death of a King	85
2 Rise of the New King	93
3 Anointment of the King as a political revolution	98

Part II King and his Kingdom

3 How Henry I Subjugated the Kingdom without Bloodshed	109
4 Otto I and the Rebellion of 937-939	125
1 Reasons for Rebellion	125

2	Similarities and Main Differences in the Descriptions of the Rebellion Found in Sources	127
3	Concept of Porphyrogenitus	130
4	Further Discussion of Reasons for Rebellion	133
5	Beginning of the Civil War in 937	151
6	Battle of Birten	152
7	After the First Battle	161
8	Lorsch Affair	165
9	Battle of Andernach	171
10	Aftermath	182

Part III War Against Heathens as a Road to Empire

5	How Hungarians were Defeated by the Ottonians	197
1	Henry's Victory in the Battle of Riade	197
2	Battle of Lechfeld, The End of Hungarian Attacks	214
3	The Hungarians as Enemies of Civilization	216
6	The Holy Lance	223
	A Symbol of Empire	
	Conclusions	237
	List of Abbreviations	241
	Bibliography	243
	Index	289

Acknowledgements

The book originates from a PhD thesis written at the Faculty of History University of Warsaw under the supervision of Jacek Banaszkiewicz and was reviewed by Tomasz Jasiński and Andrzej Pleszczyński. I thank them for all the comments and help that lead to writing this book. I also thank the following people and institutions: Amsterdam University Press staff and the anonymous reviewer, Institut Bibliotheca Fuldensis, Magda Kozłowska, Jerzy Łazor, Beata Spieralska-Kasprzyk, Marta Tycner, Paweł Żmudzki and last but not least my family, especially Jadwiga, Katarzyna, Piotr, Franciszek and above all Edyta.

Note on Citations

The citations to the primary sources are shortened in keeping with the scholarship of ancient history. Where possible the citation consists of the author and original title of the source, followed by the book and chapter, or else the year if the text is divided in such a way. If the text contains no such division then, and only in such an instance, I use a page number. In the bibliography the exact edition used is noted for all sources. For translations only the name of the translator and page number are noted – translations are listed separately in the bibliography. If no name is listed, then the translation is mine. When I make a reference to the footnotes or the introduction of a translation then the reference is made using short title (and the text is listed among other primary sources under that short title).

The exceptions to this are citations to Liudprand of Cremona's works, Widukind of Corvey's chronicle and both Regino of Prüm's chronicle and the continuation written by Adalbert of Magdeburg. I note only the titles of Liudprand's works (and *Relatio de legatione Constantinopolitana ad Nicephorum Phocam* is shortened to *Relatio de legatione*) – all citations are from Paolo Chiesa's edition. For Widukind's *Res gestae saxonicae* I use 'Widukind'. With Regino and its continuation, I use only 'Regino of Prüm', which equally applies to the part of the text written by Adalbert. In both cases I am referring to the MGH SRG editions.

I have refrained from translating *dux* into duke. From time to time I refer to East Frankish kingdom as Germany and to the West as France. This is done out of convenience, as the nineteenth and twentieth century historiography often conflates these terms.

Introduction

The tenth century was a peculiar age. It was Harald Zimmermann's *Dark Century*,¹ whilst at the same time there was also the Ottonian renaissance. For part of the older German historiography, it was the beginning of the German nation. The argument that Germany originated during the reign of Henry I, while no longer treated seriously, still looms over its perception.² Later, Otto I's imperial coronation in 962 was another focal point of history. From then on, Germany turned from a concern with the expansion into the East to the concern with Italian affairs.

It has been argued that before 962 sources written in the Ottonian kingdom did not show any interest in the promotion of the idea of an Empire. There are scholars who have claimed that most people did not see the importance of the imperial title and that Rome was perceived as a place of moral decay, and not a source of imperial glory. The title was strongly connected to the King of Italy, so that both were used interchangeably. In some instances *in Italia* was added to the imperial title.³

For the early Ottonian kingdom there are four major narrative sources from the tenth century: Adalbert of Magdeburg's continuation of the chronicle of Regino of Prüm, Liudprand of Cremona's *Antapodosis*, Widukind of Corvey's *Res gestae saxonicae*, and Hrotsvit of Gandersheim's *Gesta Ottonis*. Adalbert, Hrotsvit, and Widukind were authors of the imperial era, who composed their works after 962. This leaves *Antapodosis* as the only major historical text written before Otto's coronation.

In my opinion, Liudprand meant to show the Liudolfings as the most powerful rulers of what he called Europe, both in terms of military strength but also in the expression of their dominance over other kingdoms. The chronicler explains that he wanted to write the history of the kings and princes of all Europe. But 'Europe' here should be understood not as a geographical term, but as a metaphor for an Empire. Liudprand followed the Carolingian authors, for whom Europe was identified with the lands ruled by Charlemagne. Therefore, in *Antapodosis*, kingdoms outside his regions of interest were ignored. He concentrated on Italy, Germany, and Byzantium, which were to constitute his Europe – the Empire. The thing which binds this Empire together are their common enemies, Hungarians and Muslims,

1 Zimmermann, *Das dunkle Jahrhundert*.

2 On this, see Groth, *In regnum*, p. 2-29.

3 Maleczek, 'Otto', p. 156-57, 170-72.

who are viewed as pagans. There is no explanation for the exclusion of other kingdoms, such as France, from this construction. Europe and Empire are names standing for the continuation of the Carolingian tradition which treated them as synonymous. This construction had an additional meaning, with Liudprand depicting the Emperors of Constantinople as weak and laughable, to make the Ottonians appear worthy of Imperial glory. They might not have the crown, but it is clear that they had all the qualities which Byzantine rulers apparently lacked. They were thus *de facto* emperors.⁴

For Robert Holtzmann, Liudprand was the 'most eminent historian of that time.'⁵ His emotional and vigorous approach make him one of the most important historians of the age.⁶ For Adolf Hofmeister, Liudprand was an author of a collection of anecdotes with simply a historical background. Hofmeister even made a short list of examples of his falsehoods.⁷ Martin Lintzel has noted that it is known that 'Liudprand liked to fantasize and relate anecdotes.'⁸ He is the main subject of my book.

1 Aims and State of the Art

This book is divided into three strands of argument that are concerned with different problems stemming from Liudprand's chronicle and questions of how history was created and recreated by authors of three different eras. The main subject of my inquiries is *Antapodosis* and other sources about and from the tenth century. This will be followed with a note on how these texts were interpreted by the highly influential author of the eleventh and twelfth century: Frutolf of Michelsberg, and the way the history of the Ottonians was treated by German historiography of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The first aim is to explain and show how Liudprand constructed his narrative about the Ottonians and built an image of an ideal dynasty. Through his use of motifs and references to biblical and classical texts he made Henry I and Otto I into rulers who held every mark of being emperors, lacking only the title. The title was in the hands of the Byzantine emperors, but Ottonians were the only rulers who truly deserved it. While Liudprand has received his share

4 More on this in Grabowski, 'Liudprand z Cremony'; cf. Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p. 328-29.

5 'Hervorragendsten Historikern der Zeit', Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 230.

6 Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 243.

7 Hofmeister, *Die heilige Lanze*, p. 7; list in note 3.

8 'Daß Liudprand gern fabelt und Anekdoten erzählt, weiß man längst', Lintzel, 'Die Mathildenviten', p. 166.

of scholarship this topic has never been thoroughly researched.⁹ I will try to verify the extent to which his work could be called propaganda. There is a big problem in using this word to describe Early Middle Ages texts. Propaganda is intended for a certain audience with the clear aim of changing opinions. The way to perceive who read these works is, as Rosamund McKitterick has pointed out, to look at the manuscript tradition of the texts.¹⁰ Keeping this in mind, the notion of propaganda character of tenth century works is hindered by the limited number of surviving copies from Ottonian times. There is no evidence that they were propagated. Ludger Körntgen has also noted that there is hardly any evidence of the use of chronicles for a specific propaganda policy. They did not spread widely – for example Widukind's readership was limited to Saxony – and in Körntgen's opinion there is no clear idea about who was the intended audience for Liudprand's work.¹¹ On the other hand, as McKitterick points out, there are works that seem to have been intended as propaganda but, like Nithard's chronicle, they exist in only one manuscript.¹² This brings up the larger context of McKitterick's statements, in which she noted the existence of lay readership in the Carolingian period. The extent of this is obviously debatable, but her evidence points out that it was far from being negligible.¹³ Thus it brings up the question of the audience. Who could be seen as the intended readers of texts rich in literary allusions and sometimes full of difficult vocabulary? As she points out, for the poetry of period in which she was interested, it seems that the texts were to be read on many levels, where both the highly educated and those with less education could acquire certain information or pleasure.¹⁴ How then could Liudprand's chronicle be conceived as propaganda? Especially as, during Otto I's reign, there was no centre of culture or royal patronage of literary work.¹⁵ There was not even a court scriptorium.¹⁶ This does not mean that there were no manuscripts conceived of as propaganda. There is not enough information to state how many manuscripts of particular chronicles existed. More importantly, considering that three historical works were written by people from the Ottonian court or else somehow connected to it, it is clear

9 For a review of the latest scholarship on Liudprand, see Sivo, 'Studi recenti'; Grabowski, 'Ostatnie studia'.

10 McKitterick, *The Carolingians*, p. 241.

11 Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft*, p. 38-46 and note 100 on p. 45.

12 McKitterick, *The Carolingians*, p. 237.

13 McKitterick, *The Carolingians*, p. 227-43.

14 McKitterick, *The Carolingians*, p. 229.

15 Maleczek, 'Otto', p. 155-56.

16 McKitterick, 'Ottonian', p. 174-75.

that the text mattered. It is also important to note that limiting propaganda to a modern idea of mass produced texts does not mean that there could not have been propaganda produced in the Middle Ages, perhaps directed at a much smaller, but still politically important audience.

I am not interested in whether *Antapodosis* gives an accurate account of what really happened. I am sceptical about the possibility to see beyond – what could be called – a ‘veil of memory’.¹⁷ This expression comes from the idea that the authors in question wrote their chronicles as records of their own memory. There is a question as to the extent that their words correspond to the past. Did they describe what actually happened, or maybe their memories were wrong? For the most part these texts do not provide ways to look beyond them into the past. The available means for historical inquiry end at the ‘veil’ that is the text itself. From time to time I will venture into the question of how reliable the chronicles’ narratives are, but only to show that Liudprand was not concerned with what actually happened, but was more concerned with the themes and motifs he derived from historical events. I wish to show that chronicles cannot be separated from their ideological constructions and that Gerd Althoff’s idea that rulers controlled such texts to convey a realistic vision of the past is wrong.¹⁸ I will point out that there is little for traditional history to search for in these narratives, as differences and similarities between them are more connected to their ideologies than with facts.

As to Liudprand’s reception, I will discuss it by way of the example of Frutolf’s text. *Antapodosis* was the most important tenth century source for him. Therefore, for later authors, Liudprand’s chronicle became the main source of information via his work.

Finally, by analysing books written after the unification of Germany I will show how the historiography of the late nineteenth and twentieth century came to interpret sources from the tenth century. There was no significant change in the interpretation of the past. Some ideas that were a part of the nationalistic (and national-socialistic) ideology remained dominant even in the work of authors who were otherwise far from such ideology. There is a clear continuation in the way that Henry and Otto have been interpreted.¹⁹ This element of the so called politics of memory is generally overlooked.

17 This is the expression used in Fried’s lecture given at the German Historical Institute in London. See Fried, *The Veil of Memory*.

18 Althoff, ‘Geschichtsschreibung’, p. 156.

19 For obvious reasons these conclusions cannot be said to include all German scholarship. Nevertheless, the chosen works are more or less representative and influential.

I will make it clear that for them the sources were mostly unimportant, as their reliability was assumed and lacked the basis of any research or inquiry. Liudprand was treated suspiciously by scholars, who preferred Widukind. This attitude had more to do with faith, than with any attempt to establish his work's reliability.

This book is divided into three sections. The first concerns the making of a king, and has two chapters. The first chapter is concerned with Henry I and the way in which he was made a king after the death of Conrad I. The second is concerned with Otto I. The next section is about the civil wars and the internal affairs of the kingdom. This is also divided into two chapters, beginning with the matter of how Henry's subjugation of the kingdom, after which the first rebellion against Otto's rule is discussed. Finally, the third section is concerned with the conflicts with the Hungarians and the Holy Lance.

2 What is Myth/Mythology?

As myth is brought up in this book's title, the meaning of the word and its reference to history ought to be discussed. Often it is stated that history is about what really happened, while myths are fables, imagined stories.²⁰ Such a view comes mostly from a concept of history, originating from Leopold von Ranke, stating that objectivity and reality are the most important elements of the study of the past.²¹

Roland Barthes observed that myth is a word and that everything can be a myth.²² According to Joseph Campbell, there are four functions of myth: mystical, cosmological, sociological, and pedagogical.²³ Myth is also important in creating a community.²⁴ Such division and awareness of the roles of myth are needed, as it underlines that myths are not just tales about Heracles or similar.

The popular belief that myths are false stories from ancient times depicting events which are even further in the past is wrong. Mircea Eliade observed that among societies where myths are still alive, they are seen as

20 For example, see George Osborne Sayles, where he ascribes nineteenth century histories to a realm of false histories or myths. Sayles, *Scripta diversa*, p. 1. Cf. for criticism of history from the point of scholars of mythology, see Campbell, *The Hero*, p. 249. See also Bascom, 'The Forms of Folklore', p. 12-13; Weber, 'Historiographie und Mythographie'.

21 This was not entirely true, as Ranke was aware that there is more than facts in historians work. See: Lorenz, 'Drawing the Line', p. 47-48

22 Barthes, *Mitologie*, p. 239.

23 Campbell and Moyers, *The Power of Myth*, p. 38-39.

24 Schöpfung, 'Functions of Myth', p. 20.

true histories, distinctively different from fables. They include tales about the origin of their societies, about the hero of the group (ethnic, national, or other), and finally stories about the shamans, or people, who hold supernatural powers.²⁵ Thus, it is clear why myth is a very useful tool for a group's self-definition; for a transfer of the group's identity, or its radical change; for communication inside the group; as political myth; it also explains the status and position of the group.²⁶ Some myths give a group a special mission, a role in the larger scheme of things, connected to war and conflict. There is also the idea of rebirth, with a hope for a better existence in the future.²⁷ Many popular concepts held in the Middle Ages, both in the views of historiography and in the sources, like *translatio imperii*, are rooted in similar ideas.

Myths were and are alive. They are repeated and replicated. People imitate the heroes of the past. Even contemporary history can be seen and interpreted through myths, helping to explain what happened. This is why the past can easily be transformed into a myth. This is done involuntary, with whatever remains as people's memories fade away. Memories are reconstructed, retaining the core points of what took place and introducing other elements fitting the concept of the story. These myths appear even when there are eyewitnesses. This is not a creation of a false tale, but a way of retaining the core of an event.²⁸ It could be said that myth is true for those who repeat or create it and is a model history describing what really happened.²⁹

Bearing all this in mind, it is not strange that myths are an important element in the discussion of historical figures. Frederick II is a good example of such a transition. Even during his life, he was a mythical figure, a messiah. The myth of the eternal emperor was so strong, that it survived almost into modern times.³⁰ While Frederick is a stark example of such mythical creation, he is not the only one. Ancient Rome is sometimes wrongly treated as a society without its own myths, but the Romans had their own mythology in history itself. The creation of the city and its later narrations were myths and Roman historians were definitely mythographers.³¹

25 Eliade, *Aspekty mitu*, p. 14; cf. on criticism of Eliade Strenski, *Four Theories of Myth*, p. 106-09; on living societies Overing, 'Role of Myth', p. 5-6.

26 Schöpflin, 'Functions of Myth', p. 22-25.

27 Schöpflin, 'Functions of Myth', p. 31-33.

28 Eliade, *The Myth of the Eternal Return*, p. 34, 37, 38, 44-46; cf. still valuable as an example of process, if with caveats to many parts: Hajduk-Nijakowska, 'Proces mityzacji'. See also Alfred Speer's self-made myth of the good Nazi: Fried, 'Can Neuro-Biology', p. 30-34.

29 Eliade, *Traktat*, p. 442-44; see also Munz, 'History and Myth'.

30 Eliade, *Aspekty mitu*, p. 172-74; Cohn, 'Kaiser'; cf. Stürner, 'Friedrich II.'. Cf. Fried, 'Karl'.

31 Puhvel, *Comparative Mythology*, p. 146-48, 162-65.

Figuring out what were the myths of the Romans is very helpful in this discussion. The assumption, according to Claude Levi-Strauss, is that myths do not have authors. They are created by a community and come from group imagination.³² As Michael Grant has observed, this model does not apply to the Roman mythology, which was created to influence the masses by authors and the elites. This could mean that they were not myths, but such a division would be pointless, as it is not only the Romans who have had such a politicised mythology. In Japan, China, and even Greece myths were constantly re-evaluated by authors. One very important element of Roman mythology and historiography was the aim to create moral guidance, to present examples of proper behaviour.³³

Hans-Jürgen Hube titled his translation and retelling of Saxo Grammaticus: *Saxo Grammaticus Gesta Danorum. Mythen und Legenden des berühmten mittelalterlichen Geschichtsschreibers Saxo Grammaticus*.³⁴ While it is clear that Hube limits the definition of myth and legend to the early parts of Saxo's work, which is concerned with ancient times, it also gives us a point in this discussion. Was Gallus Anonymous putting the story of Piast the Plowman in the realm of myth?³⁵ Were many stories of *origo gentis* treated as such? Paul the Deacon, sceptical about the pagan tale of the origins of the Longobards, repeated it, but set it in a Christian reality.³⁶ The myth of the Longobards origins survives, but it is changed. Its strength leads it to further transfiguration and change, even to an impressive variation where this *origo* is transformed into a conflict between the quasi Italian Lombards and the German Longobards.³⁷

Such an attitude towards the past did not vanish with the popularisation of education. Herfried Münkler discussed various German myths in order to counter the idea that Germany was a unique state in modern times, being without myths. It appears that this was even seen as something to be proud of there.³⁸ Münkler argued that this preconception was wrong and that myths both existed in the past and are in some cases still clearly visible in German culture and in the perception of German people. Practically every generation has its own 'political myths'.³⁹

32 Cf. Levi-Strauss, 'The Structural Study', p. 216-18.

33 Grant, *Mity rzymskie*, p. 256-57, 259, 263-65.

34 Saxo Grammaticus, *Gesta Danorum: Mythen und Legenden*.

35 *Galli Anonymi Cronica*, I.1-2.

36 Paul the Deacon, *Historia gentis Langobardorum*, I.8-10.

37 See Pohl, 'Memory', p. 9.

38 Münkler, *Die Deutschen*, p. 9.

39 'Politische Mythen', Münkler, *Die Deutschen*, p. 28.

The problem of the division between myth and history was recently addressed by Johannes Burkhardt. He examined how the past was expressed as a form of mythology during World War I in Germany.⁴⁰ There are also very strong and important modern myths in India, deeply rooted in the way in which history is remembered and conceptualized.⁴¹ In response to William McNeill's term 'mythistory' Chris Lorenz has discussed the question of how to interpret history, where there is no clear division between what is myth and what is not.⁴² For McNeill and Lorenz this was in the context of the attempt to find out what really happened in the past and how to approach different views of the past. Therefore, it is clear that modern historiography is not free from falling into a mythography. A good example of the problem of the relations between myth and history is the discussion of whether the nation can be considered a myth.⁴³

Thus, myth is something strongly present in scholarship and historiography. If modern historians are, in fact, in many situations mythographers, then it would be strange not to see medieval authors in similar way. Even Althoff wrote that myths were an important element of medieval writing. In one of his more methodological articles he noted that the story about a duel between Widukind and Charlemagne evolved as a myth. He even accepted that the story about Conrad giving the crown to Henry I has some common ground with myths, but was adamant in stating that the story has enough information so as not to become one.⁴⁴

Myth is a form of communication.⁴⁵ Its main point lies in the story it tells.⁴⁶ Therefore, I see narratives of the Ottonian age as myths that were supposed to show proper acts of kings, to give examples and moral guidance. These myths were written, re-written and re-interpreted. They were alive and changed accordingly with the needs of their authors. Liudprand presented three myths of the Ottonians: the myth of a beginning and transfer of power (Part I), a myth of God's providence and Ottonians' special status (Part II), and finally a myth of a special mission (Part III).

40 Burkhardt, 'Von der Geschichte zum Mythos'. See also Frank Hadler's article, where he describes how Great Moravia was reinterpreted throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as a part of the myth of the Czechs and Slovaks, Hadler, 'Der Magna-Moravia-Mythos'.

41 Heehs, 'Myth'.

42 McNeill, 'Mythistory'.

43 Lorenz, 'Drawing the Line', p. 45-46. For a very traditional survey, where it is argued that the German nation began in the tenth century, see Averkorn, 'The Process'.

44 Althoff, 'Formen und Funktionen', p. 16-20, 31-32.

45 Barthes, *Mitologie*, p. 239.

46 Lévi-Strauss, 'The Structural Study', p. 210.

Studying such mythology demands a complex approach, and I will look at the same narrative from different points of view. I will compare Liudprand's text to the work of his contemporaries. By comparing these tales, I want to show the ideological differences and similarities in order to explain the construction of the myths and their role in the text. I will also look at a broader range of sources from different times and places. In such approach, there is the question, whether such comparison is even appropriate, whether examples from twelfth century England are applicable to the discussion of tenth century Germany. I am aware of this problem, but this is more a question of the exact tales or motifs that are being compared. In some situations it is profitable to compare the panegyrics about Æthelstan and Abd ar-Rahman III, roughly contemporary but coming from very different backgrounds and culture.⁴⁷ What is most important are the questions which are being asked and the approach taken to the sources. Of course, this does not mean that something can be compared with anything. The texts under discussion share a similar confluence of themes and ideas. Certain motifs, concepts and constructions are present in narratives written at distant times. Liudprand's narratives contain ideas that have their counterpart written down both long before he was born and long after his death. By referring to them, it is possible to better explain what the author had in mind. Therefore, the use of sometimes quite diverse texts written much later or earlier will provide insight into their general structures and ideas that were not limited to the tenth century.

3 Liudprand's Biography

Almost everything known about Liudprand's life is derived from his own writings, in addition to various speculation and hypotheses. There is no material for something that could be called a reliable biography. Only a fractured image that leaves a lot of questions can be recovered.

Liudprand was born in Pavia sometime in the early 920s. He was young when his father died and his mother re-married.⁴⁸ His family's position at the court is difficult to attest. Father and stepfather were both diplomats in the service of Hugh of Arles and later Berengar II.⁴⁹ Liudprand was introduced to the court as a member of the choir (he noted that Hugh of Arles liked his

47 Bobrycki, 'Breaking'.

48 *Antapodosis* III.24.

49 *Antapodosis* V.14, 15; Leyser, 'Ends'.

voice).⁵⁰ His career survived the political turbulences and the transition of rule from Hugh to Berengar thanks to a bribe paid to the latter. Liudprand then obtained a post in the chancellery.⁵¹

Around this time, he was given into Church service and joined court school in Pavia at young age. He subsequently became a deacon.⁵² Because of his stepfather's patronage, he became a diplomat. He led Berengar's mission in reply to Constantine Porphyrogenitus' inquiry on the status of Hugh's son Lothar. The Emperor had heard that Lothar had been stripped of power as a formal King of Italy. This was of interest to him, because his son Romanos had married Lothar's sister Bertha (Eudochia).⁵³ Liudprand was also sent to learn Greek.

Recently Andrew W. Small has proposed a view of Liudprand as a client of the Macedonian dynasty (in line with Karl Leyser's offhand remark: 'something of a client') or even of Basileios the Nothos, an influential son of Romanos Lekapenos and a grey eminence at the Byzantine court until 986.⁵⁴ While he presented some compelling arguments, Small's proposal lacks evidence. It is also highly questionable, as he interprets the depiction of Romanos in *Antapodosis* as overtly positive.⁵⁵ As will be shown, this is not the case.

Sometime after his return from the East, Liudprand left his service at Berengar's court and moved to Germany for unknown reasons. There he was probably in a position close to the diplomatic missions sent to Otto's court. He was also working as a diplomat for the King and was sent to Byzantium in 959/960 and then in 968 (described in *Relatio de Legatione*) after he was made a Bishop of Cremona in 961-962.⁵⁶ He participated in many of the most important happenings of Otto's rule. Around 970, he acquired the County of Ferrara.⁵⁷

Four of his texts are extant: *Antapodosis*, *Relatio de Legatione*,⁵⁸ *Historia Ottonis* (written between June 964 and February 965, describing the invasion

⁵⁰ *Antapodosis* IV.1.

⁵¹ *Antapodosis* V.30.

⁵² Sutherland, *Liudprand*, p. 4-5.

⁵³ *Antapodosis* VI.2.

⁵⁴ Leyser, 'Ends', p. 128

⁵⁵ Small, 'Constantinopolitan', p. 88-89, 94-95.

⁵⁶ Sutherland, *Liudprand*, p. 78. On the mission, see: Schummer, 'Liudprand of Cremona'; Mayr-Harting, 'Liudprand'; Hoffmann, 'Diplomatie in der Krise'.

⁵⁷ Sutherland, *Liudprand*, p. 98.

⁵⁸ It survived only as an editio princeps prepared by Henricus Canisius in 1600; Liudprand of Cremona, 'Legatio Luitprandi'.

of Italy in 961).⁵⁹ The final text written by Liudprand is *Homilia*, which was only discovered in the 1980s.⁶⁰

Mario Giovini has worked on Liudprand's autobiographical statements, especially on those where he refers to how he became a member of a royal court and joined the king's choir thanks to his good voice. Giovani notes that Josef Becker compared this description with what Cornelius Nepos wrote about Titus Pomponius Atticus, who was praised for having a good voice.⁶¹ Giovini has also pointed out a similarity in Liudprand's account of being complimented on his knowledge of Latin with how Atticus was praised for his knowledge of Greek and their similar reasons for leaving their homeland.⁶² Cornelius Nepos mentioned that Atticus 'was also a strict imitator of the customs of our ancestors, and a lover of antiquity' and wrote historical works about the acts of the Romans.⁶³ Additionally, like Liudprand, he was writing poems about their deeds. Giovini concluded that Liudprand styled himself as a sort of second Atticus, but in contrast to the original figure living in a period of glory, he was living in an age of decline for Italy.⁶⁴ There are some problems with this proposition, as Cornelius Nepos was not widely known in the Middle Ages.⁶⁵ It is unknown if Liudprand even knew his works. He never referenced Nepos' work, a problem which has not been addressed by Giovini.

Still, there are parallels between Liudprand's life and potential literary models. Nicholas Staubach has suggested that his reasons for going into exile could have been inspired, or else even came from his reading of Rather of Verona and Boethius. The narrative could have been based on an established model while the reality might have been quite different. There is some indication that Liudprand was part of Otto's entourage during the Augsburg

59 On this, see Grabowski, 'Liudprand of Cremona's'; Chiesa, 'Così si costruì'.

60 Bischoff, 'Ein Osterpredig'. See also Leyser, 'Liudprand'.

61 Liudprand von Cremona, *Die Werke*, p. 104 note 2; Giovini, 'Percorsi', p. 96. Recently Chiesa noted Giovini's article, but was not convinced, arguing that Nepos' works were relatively unknown and that Liudprand does not give an impression of knowing them; Liudprand, *Antapodosis*, p. 495; also François Bougard saw Giovini's proposition only as a hypothesis which is far from being proven; Liudprand, *Liudprand*, p. 486 note 4.

62 *Antapodosis* VI.3; Cornelius Nepos, *Atticus*, 2.2, 4.1; Giovini, 'Percorsi', p. 97-98.

63 Giovini, 'Percorsi', p. 98-99.

64 Cf. Reeve, 'The Manuscript Tradition', p. 53. The oldest known manuscript of the life of Atticus is from the late twelfth century (Guelferbytanus Gudianus lat. 166). There is hardly any reference to Nepos before that date; Albrecht, *A History*, p. 485; Schanz, *Geschichte*, p. 354-61. See also Cornelius Nepos, *Cornelii Nepotis Vitae*, p. V-IX.

65 Cf. Reeve, 'The Manuscript Tradition', p. 53. The oldest known manuscript of the life of Atticus is from the late twelfth century (Guelferbytanus Gudianus lat. 166). There is hardly any reference to Nepos before that date; Albrecht, *A History*, p. 485; Schanz, *Geschichte*, p. 354-61. See also Cornelius Nepos, *Cornelii Nepotis Vitae*, p. V-IX.

council in 951 which would mean that he changed sides during the Saxon intervention in Italy. For Staubach, this would lead to a better understanding of Berengar's harassment of Liudprand's family and help explain why he did not describe it in *Antapodosis*, whilst at the same time denouncing him for it.⁶⁶

Another item of Liudprand's biography that needs to be brought up here comes from Chiesa's suggestion that the manuscript which was originally in the possession of Bishop Abraham of Freising (also owner of a manuscript containing *Homily*) and is now held in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (under signature Clm 6388 – containing the whole of *Antapodosis* and the locally made copy of *Historia Ottonis* added later) was personally overseen by Liudprand, corrected and with the Greek words and notes written by him.⁶⁷ Wolfgang Huschner, based on the dates of their activity, and the parallels in their careers, has proposed that Liudprand was the notary known as Liudolf F. He also argued that their handwriting is identical.⁶⁸ His claims have been refuted by Hartmut Hoffmann.⁶⁹ If Huschner is correct, then the whole understanding of Liudprand's position during his exile would change. It has been presumed that, apart from limited work in diplomacy, he was not doing much at the Ottonian court and things changed for him only after the campaign in Italy. Identifying him as Liudolf F would not only give Liudprand a post in Otto's chancellery, but would also make him one of the most important notaries, the notary who introduced the term *consors regni* to describe queen Adelheid.⁷⁰ As noted, there is no clear explanation for the reasons for Liudprand's departure from Berengar's service. Therefore, it is possible to connect his career with Adelheid. His first patron was Hugh of Arles, Adelheid's father-in-law, and it is certainly possible that he remained loyal to the family.

Not much is known about Liudprand's later years. He appears in some documents and is known to have worked for the bishopric of Cremona, but these are only brief glimpses of his life. There is a text about the translation

66 Staubach, 'Graecae Glorae', p. 364-5

67 Chiesa, *Liutprando di Cremona*. For the contrary opinion see Hoffmann, 'Autographa'; for a more in-depth view of the Greek in Clm 6388 see Schreiner, 'Zur griechischen Schrift'. For Chiesa's reply see Chiesa, 'Sulla presunta autografia', especially p. 162-71.

68 Huschner, *Transalpine Kommunikation*, p. 572-73, 577-78.

69 Hoffmann, 'Notare', p. 468-71.

70 Huschner, *Transalpine Kommunikation*, p. 523; *Diplome Otto I* 236, 240. Adelheid had a role in enriching the culture of Germany and in the education of her children; Maleczek, 'Otto', p. 155; on education, see Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 516. Liudprand used the term *consors regni* towards Mathilda in *Antapodosis* IV.15. There is some problem with how to interpret this term. Christina La Rocca saw the use of it in sixth century texts as marking the lower status of women; La Rocca, 'Consors regni'; Liudprand, *Liudprand*, p. 492-93 note 67 (relevant part is on p. 493). Cf. Fökel, *Die Königin*, p. 56-66.

of relics dating from the twelfth century, which fits the popular views on the tenth century realities. It follows many examples of *furta sacra* and Liudprand's actions were not much different from Dietrich of Metz's.⁷¹ The story begins with Bishop of Amelia's fall from grace at the court. He went to Liudprand for help, since he was held in great esteem at the court. But there was a price for the aid: the relics of Saint Himerius from Amelia.⁷² The Bishop decided that it was worth paying and together they entered the church at night. The noise they made attracted the interest of the guards into what was happening inside, but Liudprand was prepared and bribed them, so they would not alarm the city. Afterwards, Liudprand returned to Cremona with the relics, and was welcomed there, as he enriched the city with a new patron saint. In the end, the author of the text wrote that Liudprand died returning with Teophanu from Constantinople.⁷³

Liudprand has been and still is seen by historians as a vengeful person driven by vile emotions. He is seen as a misogynist, one who not only did not like women, but hated them and took pleasure in disgracing them. He has even been called a pornographer.⁷⁴ His personal religiosity was highly doubted, but such a view, raised by Becker,⁷⁵ were largely dismissed after the discovery of *Homilia*.⁷⁶

4 Origins of *Antapodosis*

Antapodosis was written between 958 and 962. It is divided into six books, with first two books written in 958, and the later parts, up to the end of the fifth book, written around 960 during Liudprand's unspecified travel (possibly on a diplomatic mission) on the island of Paxos.⁷⁷ It is accepted that he wrote this particular section (from II.17 till V) shortly before the beginning of Otto's invasion of Italy in the 960s.⁷⁸ But, as Ernst Karpf has noted, Liudprand wrote about Constantine Porphyrogenitus in

71 See for example, Siegbert of Gembloux, *Vita Deoderici*, c. 16. On the theft of relics see Geary, *Furta Sacra*; Banaszkiewicz, 'Bischof Alberich'.

72 Himerius was a fifth/sixth century Bishop of Amelia, cf. Piazzzi, *Dal sacramentario*, p. 284-306.

73 Liudprand von Cremona, *Die Werke*, p. X, based on: Ughelli, ed., 'Translatio S. Hymerii Episcopi'.

74 Cf. Pieniǫdz, 'Wokół „Antapodosis”', p. 30.

75 Leyser, 'Liudprand', p. 120-21; Liudprand von Cremona, *Die Werke*, p. XIII-XIV, XVII, XX.

76 Liudprand of Cremona, *The Complete*, p. 19; Leyser, 'Liudprand', p. 112-13, 114; Bischoff, 'Ein Osterpredig', p. 24-34.

77 *Antapodosis* III.1; cf. Karpf, *Herrscherlegitimation*, p. 6.

78 Karpf, *Herrscherlegitimation*, p. 7-8; cf. Hauck, 'Erzbischof Adalbert', p. 299-305.

the third book of *Antapodosis* as though he were alive, when he died on 9 November 959. Most probably then, at least the third book was written before 960, or in the first few months of that year.⁷⁹ The final, sixth book, was probably added later, definitely after Otto's imperial coronation in 962.⁸⁰ *Antapodosis* was never finished, ending abruptly in the middle of its narrative. It is unknown what Liudprand would have included in further parts of his work, although Philippe Buc has proposed that it would have been Otto's Imperial coronation, for which there is unfortunately no proof.⁸¹

There are two redactions of *Antapodosis*. Liudprand subsequently rewrote and rephrased some parts of his text, which included his writing Greek words differently. The manuscript overseen by Liudprand (Clm 6388) was the second redaction.⁸² The changes he made to the chronicle have little impact on the analysis undertaken in the present study.

Liudprand stated he wrote his text for Recemund of Elvira, in 956 an ambassador of the Caliph of Cordoba, Abd ar-Rahman III to Otto.⁸³ Liudprand was then asked to compose the history of all Europe, consisting mainly of 'the deeds of the emperors and kings'. Liudprand was to be able to base his writing not on 'hearsay', but could write 'like an eyewitness'. In 958 he excused himself for being late with his work because the size of it and expressed his uncertainty over whether he was the right person for the task before complaining about the 'envy of detractors'.⁸⁴ It has been suggested that this is a reference to his previous experience of writing, evidence for which would be a catalogue entry, where he is noted as the author of an otherwise unknown historical work. All of this is rather doubtful.⁸⁵

79 *Antapodosis* III.26; Karpf, *Herrscherlegitimation*, p. 8.

80 *Antapodosis* VI.4.

81 Buc, 'Noch einmal', p. 166.

82 Liudprandus Cremonensis, *Opera Omnia*, p. LXXIV-LXXIX; Williams, 'The Transmission and Reception', p. 96-100.

83 He was sometimes identified with Rabi ibn Zaid, on Recemund and *Calendar of Cordoba* attributed to him, see Christys, *Christians*, p. 108-34. Calling Recemund a Bishop of Elvira might mean that Liudprand either had contacts with Recemund after his return to Cordoba, or had a source of further information, as Recemund most probably took this post in 958 (on the post see there, p. 111).

84 'Imperatorum regumque facta [...] auditu dubius [...] visione certus [...] detrectatorum invidia', *Antapodosis* I.1; Squatriti, p. 44.

85 Sutherland, *Liudprand*, p. 50-53. The idea was revived in Riu Riu, 'Consideraciones en torno'; see the point by point discussion of this proposition on a well known blog: Jarrett, 'Chasing a Fake Chronicler'; on this see also comments by Bougard in Liudprand, *Liudprand*, p. 37-38; on the author of the chronicle of the *fake Liudprand* see Rodríguez Mediano and García-Arenal, 'Jerónimo Román de la Higuera'.

It is interesting to see how Liudprand responded to his imagined critics. Quoting Terence, he writes that they would attack him as there are too many books and too few readers for all of them.⁸⁶ Also, everything has already been said. Liudprand's answer is that those people who 'love knowledge' are like people who have 'dropsy', with each one read they need more books to read.⁸⁷

He notes that the stories about pagans could be harmful to readers and as the acts of those whom he describes in his work were not in any way worse than those of Julius, Pompey, Hannibal, Hasdrubal, and Scipio Africanus, then there is no reason not to write about them. His chronicle is also needed as there is a clear connection between the acts of its heroes and God's providence. Showing this, would enable Liudprand to point at both proper and wrong deeds. Thus, he describes the acts of 'weak kings and effeminate princes', as examples of bad rulers.⁸⁸ In *Antapodosis* it is seen how it is right for God to punish them for their improper deeds.

Liudprand also writes that a mind is hampered by reading the same things all the time, and that readers occasionally need a change. It could either be a 'comedy', or a 'history of the heroes'.⁸⁹ In their interpretation of these statements, some scholars have created the idea that Liudprand purposely wrote a humorous history of Europe. Gustavo Vinay has called the chronicle 'La "Commedia" di Liutprando'.⁹⁰

Initially Liudprand did not explain *Antapodosis*, the strange title he chose for his work. In two manuscripts, in Clm 6388 and in the twelfth or thirteenth century Harl. 2688⁹¹ the following text is placed at the beginning of the text:

IN THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND SON AND HOLY SPIRIT, HERE
BEGINS THE ΑΝΤΑΠΟΔΟΣΕΩΣ [retributive] BOOK OF THE KINGS AND
PRINCES OF THE EUROPEAN AREA, COMPOSED BY LIUDPRAND,
DEACON OF THE PAVIAN CHURCH, ΕΝ ΤΗ ΕΧΜΑΛΟΣΤΑ ΑΥΤΟΥ [during
his wanderings], FOR RECEMUND, BISHOP OF THE SPANISH PROVINCE
OF ELVIRA.⁹²

86 Terentius, *The Eunuch*, Pr. 41.

87 'Phylosophi ydropicorum', *Antapodosis* I.1; Squatriti, p. 44.

88 'Enervorum [...] regum principumve effeminatorum', *Antapodosis* I.1; Squatriti, p. 45.

89 'Comoediarum [...] heroum [...] historia', *Antapodosis* I.1; Squatriti, p. 44.

90 Vinay, *Alto Medioevo latino*, p. 391.

91 Liudprandus Cremonensis, *Opera Omnia*, p. XXXI-XXXII.

92 'IN NOMINE PATRIS ET FILII ET SPIRITUS SANCTI INCIPIT LIBER ΑΝΤΑΠΟΔΟΣΕΩΣ REGUM ATQUE PRINCIPUM PARTIS EUROPAE, A LIUDPRANDO, TICINENSIS ECCLESIAE DIACONE, ΕΝ ΤΗ ΕΧΜΑΛΟΣΤΑ ΑΥΤΟΥ, AD RECEMUNDUM, HISPANIAE PROVINTIAE LIBERRITANAE ECCLESIAE EPISCOPUM, EDITUS', *Antapodosis* Incipit; Squatriti, p. 41.

This title is only later explained in a second prologue at the beginning of the third book. There, writing to an unnamed Recemund, Liudprand suggests that he probably wondered why the chronicle is given the title *Retribution*, since it is about 'illustrious men'. He explains that he wanted to repay all the misdeeds he and his family endured under Berengar and Willa. He attacks them, writing that Berengar 'does not so much rule as tyrannize in Italy', while Willa is 'called a second Jezebel on account of the immensity of her despotism and a child-eating witch on account of her insatiable desire for robbery'.⁹³ Liudprand wanted to show their wrongdoing, and their sacrilegious acts. He wanted to achieve a retribution for their evil deeds and praise good people.

Finally, in the first chapter of the sixth book, Liudprand describes himself as the victim of various evil things and states that he should be a 'writer of tragedies instead of histories', nevertheless he implores his readers to be optimistic.⁹⁴ It is not proper to lament over misfortunes; instead everyone should look for a positive change. Liudprand quotes both Psalm 22, in which David explains that he will not only be protected but also will be granted many good things in return for his faithfulness and loyalty to God, and the Letter to the Romans (Rom 5.3-5) about the gratification for believing in God.

It is also important to consider whom Liudprand addressed his chronicle to. Unlike Widukind's chronicle, it was not meant for a member of the Liudolfings family, but was dedicated to a legate of a foreign power. Recemund's mission was treated as a very important one. He was welcomed with great pomp at the court.⁹⁵ This does not mean that *Antapodosis* was actually written for him to read. It is possible that Recemund never received it.

Some scholars are doubtful about Liudprand's expressed reasons for writing. In his discussion of the similarities between *Antapodosis* and *Gesta Berengarii imperatoris*, Buc noted that Liudprand's chronicle could be

93 'Virorum illustrium [...] in Italia non regnat sed tyranizat [...] ob inmensitatem tyrannidis secunda Iezebel et ob rapinarum insacietatem Lamia proprio appellatur vocabulo, actus designet ostendat et clamitet', *Antapodosis* III.1; Squatriti, p. 110-11. Cf. *Historia Ottonis* c. 1. Liudprand also added that Willa, the wife of Berengar II had an affair with a certain chaplain Dominic on account of the size of his penis. This could be Liudprand suggesting that Berengar was not manly enough for her, *Antapodosis* V.32; Balzaretti, 'Liutprand', p. 121.

94 'Tragoedum [...] quam historiographum', *Antapodosis* VI.1; Squatriti, p. 195.

95 Stephen Wailes has speculated that the way in which Recemund was welcomed was criticized by Hrotsvith. Pelagius, one of main martyrs of her work, was executed after he refused Abd ar Rahman III's sexual advances, Wailes, *Spirituality and Politics*, p. 68-78; Wailes, 'The Sacred Stories in Verse', p. 107-09; Stevenson, 'Hrotsvit in Context', p. 58-59; Dronke, *Women Writers*, p. 56-57.

thought of as a reply to that text, as some sort of anti-panegyric.⁹⁶ Elsewhere, Buc claimed that the whole idea of the chronicle was to provide a needed cause for the justification of Otto's campaigns in Italy.⁹⁷ Then, he suggests that Liudprand was attempting to hide his treacherous behaviour towards the Italian kings by describing them in the most evil way.⁹⁸ *Antapodosis* is open to interpretations, as can be seen in Leyser's suggestion that the text was mainly connected with the relations between Christianity and Islam, where it would be some form of instruction about proper behaviour for the Spanish Church.⁹⁹ While in his translation of Liudprand's works Paolo Squatriti noted that *Antapodosis* was written for readers from outside Saxony, he also saw the German magnates as a targeted audience.¹⁰⁰ Finally, Anastasia Brakhman proposed Rather of Verona as the intended reader of *Antapodosis* in the hope that he would help Liudprand's career.¹⁰¹ The only certain thing is that the only extant tenth century copy of the chronicle was in the possession of Abraham of Freising and that he also possessed other works by Liudprand. It is also possible that there was a complete manuscript of the first redaction in Metz, but all that is left is a photocopy of a medieval excerpt containing the Greek words from it.¹⁰²

5 Language of *Antapodosis*

Liudprand's language is an example of the learned Latin of the tenth century.¹⁰³ He knew it well and was able to stylise his text to resemble classical authors like Virgil. An evocation of other writers is an important element of his style. His use of Greek is also interesting.¹⁰⁴ There has been some debate about the extent of his knowledge of Greek.¹⁰⁵ Why Liudprand decided to write words or even sentences in Greek, a language not well

96 Buc, 'Noch einmal', p.164.

97 Buc, *The Dangers*, p.19; Buc, 'Noch einmal', p. 167.

98 Buc, 'Italian Hussies', p. 210.

99 Leyser, 'Ends', p. 133-135.

100 Liudprand of Cremona, *The Complete*, p. 14-15, 87 note 30.

101 Brakhman, *Außenseiter*, p. 65-71. For a review of Brakhman study, which also notes its weaknesses, see Roach, 'Anastasia Brakhman'.

102 See Grabowski, 'Author's Annotations'

103 On Liudprand's language, see Gandino, *Il vocabolario*; Ricci, *Problemi sintattici*. See also Janson, *Prose Rhythm*, p. 41-42.

104 On this, see: Grabowski, 'Author's Annotations'.

105 Sutherland, *Liudprand*, p. 23; Sutherland, 'The Mission', p. 73 note 57; cf. Schreiner, 'Zur griechischen Schrift', p. 305-17; Koder and Weber, *Liutprand*, p. 23-61.

known in the West, is difficult to explain.¹⁰⁶ Liudprand could not expect that readers would understand what he wrote, especially as the meaning of words or sentences could not be deduced from the context in which they were used. Some scholars believe that this was his way of showing off his education and knowledge. In Clm 6388 Greek is transliterated and translated into Latin.¹⁰⁷ This shows that for Liudprand being understood was something of great significance. Staubach, with whom I agree, has argued that Liudprand's use of Greek was a way of highlighting the Imperial idea behind his chronicle.¹⁰⁸

There are 14 poems in *Antapodosis*. Liudprand clearly wanted to show his poetic abilities. The clearest example of this is his invocation to mountains that let Berengar II and Willa pass them.¹⁰⁹ There is no pattern for their appearance in the text. Sometimes they are difficult to interpret.¹¹⁰ In the poems Liudprand expressed his opinions more freely. They also allowed him to reinforce some of his arguments by repeating them in a different form. Poems also make a change in the monotonous narration. Including poetry in a historical work comes from ancient rhetoric and the Bible, where the prose text of scripture is interlaced with poetry.¹¹¹ Also, as Henry of Huntingdon argued, it provides a moral guidance just as a history does.¹¹²

106 Cf. Berschin, *Greek Letters*.

107 Liudprand of Cremona, *The Complete*, p. 16-17; for the discussion of the Greek used in Clm 6388 see Koder and Weber, *Liutprand*, p. 62-68; see also Schreiner, 'Zur griechischen Schrift' and Grabowski, 'Author's Annotations'.

108 Staubach, 'Graecae Gloriam', p. 347, 349, 365. See also Grabowski, 'Author's Annotations'. Anastasia Brakhman has a completely different argument about Liudprand's use of Greek: along with the structure of the work it was an attempt at self-presentation as a person eligible for work in Otto's diplomatic service. She also adheres to the idea that as the readership of Greek was limited, then it is possible to see Rather of Verona among the few intended readers. Brakhman, *Außenseiter*, p. 48-50. This is hardly proven and ignores the manuscript evidence for the text including translations in various forms.

109 *Antapodosis* V.11.

110 Nevertheless, never to such extent as in case of Dudo of Saint-Quentin's chronicle, who like Liudprand, used many poems, but because of their length and complexity it is impossible to have one interpretation of them. See Lifshitz, 'Dudo of Saint Quentin', p. 914. On Dudo see Kersken, *Geschichtsschreibung in Europa der 'nationes'*, p. 81-86.

Michael Lapidge sees Liudprand, Atto of Vercelli and Dudo as continental authors who followed a hermeneutic style and used intentionally difficult, obscure and arcane words. Lapidge, 'The Hermeneutic Style', p. 70-71.

111 Brakhman saw in Liudprand's use of poems an influence from his 'friend and mentor' ('Freund und Mentor') Rather of Verona; Brakhman, *Außenseiter*, p. 55.

112 Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, [Prologus]; cf. Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p. 360-3 (on the possible negative effects of using poetry in medieval historiography, see p. 363-66).

6 Other Contemporary Sources: Widukind's *Res gestae saxonicae*; *Continuation of the Chronicle of Regino of Prüm*; Hrotsvit's *Gesta Ottonis*

The corpus of Ottonian historiography is diverse. Widukind's *Res Gestae Saxonicae* was written in the late 960s, and later expanded to cover the rest of Otto's reign.¹¹³ It was dedicated to Otto's daughter Mathilda.¹¹⁴ It covers the history of the Saxons from their *origo gentis* to the death of Otto in 973 and the beginning of Otto II's reign.¹¹⁵ Narratives about the Ottonians found in Liudprand's chronicle have corresponding accounts in Widukind's text. As there is no direct evidence that either author knew about the other or his work, the *Res Gestae Saxonicae* provides ample material for comparison. Widukind presents the story from a Saxon perspective, rarely ventures abroad and is mostly concerned with what took place in his homeland and around the ruling family.

Continuation of the Chronicle of Regino of Prüm, was most probably written by Adalbert of Magdeburg, who continued the narrative of Regino's text from 907 to 967. As Lintzel, Karl Hauck and Buc have shown, it was in many passages based on Liudprand's works.¹¹⁶ It is valuable not only because of Adalbert's range of interests, but also because of the changes he made. As others have shown, Adalbert also made a revision of Regino's text in order to create a unified text (yet one which was clearly written by two authors).¹¹⁷ Adalbert probably wrote in the context of Otto II's imperial coronation. It would have been then designed by William of Mainz as a present for his younger brother on such a glorious occasion. The final version was given to Otto II and then placed in the archives, from where it was acquired by Annalista Saxo. Other manuscripts were based on versions written prior to the occasion.¹¹⁸

Hrotsvit is nowadays one of the most popular authors of the tenth century. While her theatrical works are the best known, all her texts have

113 On Widukind, see Beumann, *Widukind*. See also Bagge, *Kings*, p. 23–94. On the dating, see Robbie, 'Can Silence'.

114 Widukind, *Ad Dominam Mathildam Imperatoris Filiam Libri Primi Incipit Prephatio*.

115 On that see: Banaszkiewicz, 'Widukind'.

116 Lintzel, 'Studien', p. 352–69; Hauck, 'Erzbischof Adalbert', p. 276–353; Buc, 'Noch einmal', p. 151–78. Michael Frase has disagreed with this thesis and he has noted many differences between both texts. In his view, the similarities are not sufficient proof that one text has been based on another, Frase, *Friede und Königsherrschaft*, p. 50–56.

117 See for example Frase, *Friede und Königsherrschaft*, p. 23; Regino of Prüm and Adalbert of Magdeburg, *History and politics*, p. 57.

118 Jasiński, 'Zagadnienie', p. 20–22; for more context see Nass, *Die Reichschronik*, p. 264–67.

received attention from scholars.¹¹⁹ *Gesta Ottonis* is one of the two historical poems she wrote; the other is the history of the Gandersheim monastery known as *Primordia Coenobii Gandeshemensis*.¹²⁰ Sadly, *Gesta* exists only in an incomplete version with many parts lost. There are some similarities between the text of Hrotsvit's *Gesta Ottonis* and Liudprand's *Antapodosis* in information and the wording used.¹²¹

Vita Mathildis reginae antiquior and *posterior* will also be considered. While both were written long after Otto's death, they contain much valuable information about the events described by Liudprand and others.¹²²

7 Interpreter of Liudprand: Frutolf of Michelsberg

Frutolf's biography is not well known.¹²³ He wrote about many subjects, and the most popular of his works was his chronicle. He was a director of the *scriptorium*, the library, and the school at Bamberg. There he had access to many texts, not only from Germany, but also from Italy and France. His main source was the collection of historical works held there. Frutolf ended his text in 1099. His only known original manuscript was later continued by Ekkehard of Aura.¹²⁴

Frutolf attempted to construct a unified text from sometimes contrary sources, breaking one narration with interpolation from elsewhere. While he followed previous authors, he nevertheless expanded upon them and made corrections. He was a supporter of Henry IV and his chronicle was written with the glorification of the Emperor in mind.¹²⁵

His Chronicle had many copies and it is clear that it was the main source of knowledge about their history for many generations.¹²⁶ It was both read

119 Cf. the following collections of articles Brown and Wailes, eds., *A Companion to Hrotsvit*; Brown, Wilson, and McMillin, eds., *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim*; Wilson, ed., *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: rara avis in Saxonia?*. The edited collection of a selection of her works with an introduction and interpretative essay, *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: A Florilegium* is a good introduction to Hrotsvit.

120 Cf. Szczepański, 'Proroktwo i obietnica'.

121 Staubach, 'Graecae Glorior', p. 364 and especially note 141 there.

122 On Vita, see Schütte, *Untersuchungen*.

123 Gawłowska, *Frutolfa*, p. 57. The best concise introduction to Frutolf, his life and his work is the introduction to the English translation of the last 100 years of his chronicle, see Frutolf and Eccardus, *Chronicles*, especially p. 15-44. Christian Lohmer prepares new edition of the chronicle for MGH.

124 Gawłowska, *Frutolfa*, p. 58-61, 79-80, 103.

125 Gawłowska, *Frutolfa*, p. 107-11, 113, 117, 123-24.

126 Cf. Neudeck, *Erzählen von Kaiser Otto*, p. 74.

and directly served either as the basis upon which other chronicles were written, or else was used extensively in the process of making a new text. Among those that used his work are: Annalista Saxo, Godfrey of Viterbo and Otto of Freising.¹²⁷ Such influence marks Frutolf as among the foremost chroniclers of his times. The nature of the reception of his text made his work a guide for subsequent authors. The various continuations also had a role in disseminating his narrative and serve as further proof of his status as a quintessential chronicler of the end of eleventh and beginning of twelfth century. This popularity make Frutolf an important source of the views about and visions of how Ottonian history was perceived in later periods.

8 Understanding Liudprand's Works: Textbooks

When inquiring into the subject of the modern reception of the Ottonian past, a guideline as to which texts will be considered has to be established. For this type of study biographies and more general studies of dynasties are the most fitting. While some of this type of work have a questionable academic status, they give a much better insight into the character and nature of the interpretation of the past. Such works were also much more influential with the general public than more academic scholarships.

While it seems that the best date to begin the inquiry would be the unification of Germany in 1871, this has a certain limitation. The most influential work on Henry I for most of the later nineteenth and twentieth centuries was first published in 1837: Georg Waitz's *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter König Heinrich I.*¹²⁸ The book had later editions which updated the text to include what was then the most up to date modern research, with the third edition appearing in 1885. Therefore, it seems most sensible to include the post-unification edition of this book. There is also the need to define the best end date of research. For such an arbitrary limit I went with the beginning of the twenty-first century, therefore Matthias Becher's biography of Otto will not be discussed here.¹²⁹

The selection was achieved by including the most well-known books that also mark certain stages in the historical research and approach to the Ottonian dynasty. This is of course a small sample, as German historiography

¹²⁷ Annalista Saxo; *Otonis episcopi Frisingensis Chronica*; Dunbabin, 'The Distinctive Elements', p. 37-38; Ehlers, *Otto von Freising*, p. 166.

¹²⁸ The first edition from 1837 included an introduction by Ranke.

¹²⁹ Becher, *Otto*.

is one of the most widely published, but the character of each of the books signifies the dominant traditions and changes that have taken place. The following books will be discussed here: Waitz, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter König Heinrich I*; Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser Otto der Große*; Cartellieri, *Die Weltstellung des Deutschen Reiches 911-1047*; Lüdtkke, *König Heinrich I*; Thoss, *Heinrich I (919-936)*; Holtzmann, *Kaiser Otto der Grosse and Geschichte der sächsischen Kaiserzeit*; Günter, *Kaiser Otto der Grosse*; Diwald, *Heinrich der Erste*; Giese, *Heinrich I*; Althoff, *Die Ottonen*; Althoff and Keller, *Die Zeit des späten Karolinger und der Ottonen*; Laudage, *Otto der Grosse*.¹³⁰

When discussing German historiography, a special place needs to be given to Ranke.¹³¹ In 1833 he opened the historical seminary at the University of Berlin. Whilst he is best remembered these days for his often misunderstood statement that his aim was to write 'how it really was' ('wie es eigentlich gewesen') and for his establishing the methodological drive to go back to primary sources, mainly archives and documents, Ranke's influence on German historiography was not limited to this. Even more important was that his students governed the most important institution for studying the past, from MGH to *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*.¹³² His seminary should be seen as the birthplace of the dominant group of German historians in the nineteenth century. His influence was not only confined to his students, but should also include those who were influenced by the works of Ranke's school. His pupils believed that the aim of the historian is to present an account of what really happened in the past, whilst additionally many of them were also proud patriots and promoters of the idea of Germany acquiring a fitting place amongst other states and nations. These beliefs were not seen as contradictory for them, something which is best exemplified

130 While at first sight it could be profitable to look at the way the Ottonians were seen in, say, Poland, or England, this would not provide sufficient basis for the discussion of German myths. There is not enough comparative material (for example the first Polish biography of Otto the Great, written by Jerzy Strzelczyk, was published by Wydawnictwo Poznańskie in 2018) and to a certain degree these works are based on German scholarship. Thus, the subject of how German scholarship was read by the outsiders and how it influenced, or not, both national and international histories in nineteenth and twentieth century is rather a subject for another study.

131 The following section is a very brief summary of the history of German historiography. This subject easily encompasses multiple multi-volume studies, and consequently some simplification of the complicated evolution of German historical scholarship has had to be employed. On the subject generally, see Althoff, ed., *Die Deutschen*; Moraw and Schieffer, eds., *Die deutschsprachige Mediävistik*.

132 Thompson, *A History*, p. 187-88; see also chart on p. 190-91.

by the attitude of Ranke's student Friedrich Wilhelm von Giesebrecht. In *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit* he combined a very detailed account of German history with nationalist and imperial idea of Germany.¹³³ Most of Ranke's students were firm believers in *Machtpolitik*, that is the view of power (understood broadly as military might and political influence) as the driving force of politics in a world which was dominated by so called Great Powers.¹³⁴ As has already been noted, Ranke and his followers had significant influence on the choices for employment at most of the academic centres in Germany. This created the situation where a small group of anti-revolutionary and mostly pro-Prussian (or to be exact pro-Hohenzollern) professors shaped later generations' conception of history as they decided who would become a professional historian.¹³⁵ It has to be added that never before had historians had such political importance in Germany as in the years 1830-71, that is in the period leading up to the unification of the country.¹³⁶

Ranke himself wrote what could be called 'national histories'. His works were deeply rooted in the Romantic rejection of the Enlightenment and its claims to universalism. It was in the same tradition that the brothers Grimm research into folk-tales was carried out.¹³⁷ For German historians, the state became a focal point of their research, seen as the point to which history led up to. The German nation was divided into regional elements, but was bound by the higher power that is the state and was distinct from other European nations. Such views led to the domination of certain subjects in German historical research: politics, dynasties and the military.¹³⁸ Ranke saw history as a manichean conflict between powers and ideas. This conflict could be a clash between the Empire and the Papacy, but also between religion and science.¹³⁹ Whilst ostensibly he was not involved in modern day political affairs, it did not mean he was against Prussian policies. He endured a fair share of criticism, even from his own students, for such a

133 Mierzwa, *Historia*, p. 212-13. Nationalism is a loaded word, and thus it can be difficult to discuss what it actually means when it is said that someone was nationalist or espoused nationalist attitudes. For example, Ranke has been labeled a 'European' as being the opposite of a nationalist; see Iggers, 'The Intellectual', p. 44. Such a view is highly limiting since, in the nineteenth century, there was little contradiction between being both a nationalist and a European.

134 Thompson, *A History*, p. 189.

135 Iggers, 'Nationalism', p. 20.

136 Iggers, *The German*, p. 91.

137 Berger, 'The Invention', p. 23.

138 Berger, 'The Invention', p. 28-30; Iggers, 'The Intellectual', p. 48.

139 Stuchtey, 'German', p. 166.

lack of direct involvement in politics.¹⁴⁰ This does not mean that his works were devoid of reference to modern politics. There is a clear political outlook visible throughout his works, in which he expresses an anti-revolutionary attitude and to a certain degree a belief in the old conservative structures of Austria and Prussia.¹⁴¹ His students were in this respect very different. Heinrich von Sybel, for example, who broke with Ranke, was one of the pillars of the so-called Prussian school of history. For them, history and politics were united, to the extent that a historical work written about the French revolution was overtly a work written against the possibility of revolution in Germany.¹⁴²

In the early years of his seminary, Ranke conceived a series of books that would describe the history of Germany under the reign of the Ottonians. This was proposed in line with the patriotic tendencies which were present at the time in Germany. The Saxon dynasty reigning over a unified Germany was something that was looked up to and admired in the early part of nineteenth century. This was well understood by Ranke.¹⁴³ It was also clearly connected to a search for the origins of the German state and nation.¹⁴⁴ His own pupils would produce the work, and would take part in a contest to write the best possible text. Ranke later mentioned that he was inspired by other works on the great dynasties.¹⁴⁵ It can be argued that, to a certain extent, these books expressed Ranke's ideas about historical work most profoundly, of historical narratives consisting of a detailed account of what happened in the past, devoid of the historian's emotions.¹⁴⁶

Three authors who had enormous impact on the nineteenth century vision of the Ottonian kingdom came from this school. The first was Waitz and his already mentioned work *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter König Heinrich I*. Waitz was probably the closest student to Ranke and it is interesting to note that, rather symbolically, they died two days apart.¹⁴⁷ The book exemplifies Ranke's school and ethos, being very dry in style, and a systematic reconstruction of history based on a critical reading of

140 Thompson, *A History*, p. 189.

141 Eskildsen, 'Leopold Ranke's', p. 447, 449; cf. Schleier, 'Geschichtstheorie', especially p. 120. Ranke could be seen as someone who saw God's providence at work in history, an idea which has to a large extent been left out of the vulgarised view of his work.

142 Thompson, *A History*, p. 209-10; cf. Schleier, 'Geschichtstheorie', p. 128-29.

143 Ranke, 'Vorrede', p. VI-VII.

144 Zientara, "'Teutones'"; Grabowski, 'Wizje'.

145 Thompson, *A History*, p. 188.

146 Eskildsen, 'Leopold Ranke's', p. 453.

147 Thompson, *A History*, p. 202.

the sources. Waitz himself was considerably more involved in the politics of the time than was Ranke. He participated in the Frankfurt Assembly in 1848-1849 on behalf of *Erbkaiserliche Partei*, a moderate-liberal party that wanted a united Germany with the Hohenzollerns as Emperors.¹⁴⁸ From 1875 to his death in 1886 he was also the president of MGH at the time when it was reformed from being a private into a state institution, located in Berlin. Waitz's book was not only popular, but had a long lifetime with two subsequent editions during his life.¹⁴⁹ His book became the main reference and served as the only serious biography of Henry until the twenty-first century.

Ranke's second student was Rudolf Köpke, and his entry was on Otto I. *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter der Herrschaft König Otto's I. 936-951* was published in 1838.¹⁵⁰ The rest of Otto's reign was described by Wilhelm Dönniges.¹⁵¹ Köpke was also involved in political affairs. He participated in the events of 1848 and in 1866 published a series of articles and then a booklet propagating the idea of the unification of Germany under Prussia.¹⁵² Despite his political sympathies, Köpke was loyal to Ranke's concepts for the writing of history.¹⁵³

There is one other student of Ranke that has to be considered here. Whilst he did not become a historian, he nevertheless had a profound influence on the direction of historical research. King Maximilian II of Bavaria studied in Berlin in 1830-1 before he acquired his crown and was taught by Ranke. Historical research remained one of his greatest interests and it was an important element of Maximilian's project for making Bavaria and especially Munich an important centre of culture and sciences. Thus, in 1858 a Historical Commission was created at the Bavarian Academy of Sciences and Humanities.

This institution took over the role of publishing the *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs* and it was where Waitz's book was published from the second edition onwards.¹⁵⁴ Also, Köpke began work on the second edition of his book on Otto for the Commission, in which he encompassed the whole reign. The work started in 1863, but took a long time to complete, the completion of the work undoubtedly was effected by Köpke's decision

148 On Ranke and the revolution, see also Mommsen, *Stein*, p. 145-59.

149 Waitz, *Jahrbücher* (1885) p. V, VII.

150 Köpke, *Jahrbücher*.

151 Dönniges, *Jahrbücher*.

152 Köpke, *Das Ende*.

153 Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. V.

154 Waitz, *Jahrbücher* (1837), p. II; Waitz, *Jahrbücher* (1863), p. II; Waitz, *Jahrbücher* (1885), p. II.

to rewrite his work from scratch. The book also changed in its style and its scope. Instead of a yearly account like the first edition of *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs*, it became a biography of the King, something highlighted by the change of the title: *Kaiser Otto der Große*, with the earlier title *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs* relegated to a subtitle. Work on the book was interrupted by Köpke's bad health in the late 1860s before his death in 1870, leaving behind an unfinished book. The Commission chose Ernst Dümmler, with whom Köpke had been in contact, to finish the work.¹⁵⁵ Dümmler was also a student of Ranke and later on succeeded Waitz in the post of director of MGH.

Alexander Cartellieri, another person important in my study, exemplifies both the evolution of the German historiography and the influence of Ranke. Cartellieri, who died in 1955, was originally one of the most eminent scholars of the Wilhelmine era, but lived long enough not only to see it fall apart, but also to witness to the end of the Third Reich. This long life made him into a somewhat peculiar figure, to some extent a leftover from bygone times. His *Die Weltstellung des Deutschen Reiches* shows this quite well. It is a book that was deeply rooted in nineteenth century ideas of the state as an ultimate goal and in the concepts of *macht*, as both the aim and the goal for nations. *Macht* – broadly speaking and understood even more broadly – power was seen as the end-goal of the state.¹⁵⁶ Thus he was interested in politics and military history but also with the idea of the need for painstakingly researched facts. Even though the book was published after the end of the Empire in the period of the Weimar Republic, it exemplifies the *longue durée* of historiographical concepts. After 1918 there was hardly a change with regard to the view of the state as the end goal of all progress, in which it fought for its rightful place with other states. Even though there were repeated attempts to shift historical research onto a different track (for example by Karl Lamprecht in the nineteenth century), there was a clear continuity of ideas and approach up to 1945.¹⁵⁷ In the perception of many German historians the success of policy and of politicians was a form of moral justification for their actions.¹⁵⁸

Thus, when in 1933 the new regime led by Hitler conceived the idea of a Third Reich, it meant more the breaking with Weimar – that being

¹⁵⁵ Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. V-VI.

¹⁵⁶ Iggers, *The German*, p. 130.

¹⁵⁷ Stuchtey, 'German', p. 164-65.

¹⁵⁸ Iggers, *The German*, p. 96.

the Second Reich – than an attempt to return to the Imperial past of the Hohenzollerns. For the historiography of the Saxon dynasty, the new regime provided new impetus. This was the consequence of the combination of the firm ideological belief on the part of the new elite of a connection with the Saxons and of anniversaries lining up. In 1936, on millennial anniversary of the death of Henry I there were extravagant celebrations led by Heinrich Himmler in Quedlinburg.¹⁵⁹

This new age also introduced new people to compete with established academia. NSDAP was not a unified political party and the ideology of it was a garbled mixture of not only different but sometimes contrary ideas and concepts. This was also seen in the approach taken towards academia. On the one hand, there was a clear need for the new regime to legitimise itself through a connection with the old elites, but at the same time there was a strong element of rebellion against that establishment. Therefore, it is not surprising that the two most important books on Henry that appeared at that time, were written by the people who were outside of the old system, and yet who still claimed to fit with the tradition of a previous research.

To understand this mixture, it is helpful to look at the authors. The first author under consideration here is Franz Lüdtkke, who was not a professional historian – in the sense of being employed in academia. He was a teacher in what was then German Bydgoszcz before World War I. Active in nationalistic circles, he was especially angry about its outcome. He was viciously anti-Polish and believed that the lands lost by Germany in the war should be

159 Besier, 'Neo-Pagan Religiosity'. Halle, '936 Begräbnis Heinrichs I.', p. 17-19; the speech Himmler made during the celebrations was subsequently printed: Himmler, *Rede*.

The division of power in the Third Reich and the conflicts between Hitler's associates had an impact on how Henry I was perceived. He was an SS hero, consequently the organizations under the control of Alfred Rosenberg were much less interested in him; Halle, '936 Begräbnis Heinrichs I.', p. 19-20. One of the exceptions to this was the book by Werner Radig, who argued for the existence of a cycle of 1000 years in history, enabling him to directly compare Henry with Hitler in the introduction to his book. He arranged a series of dates for Henry which were intended to parallel Hitler's career. A reader aware of Nazi history would easily see the parallel with the dates 919, 924 and 933. With the addition of 1000 years, the dates can be connected with Hitler's rise. So while Henry became a king in 919, Hitler created NSDAP in 1919. In Radig's argument Henry had difficulties in the East in 924 while 1924 was the year of the Munich Putsch. In 933 Henry won a war against the Hungarians, while Hitler became Chancellor in 1933. Radig, *Heinrich I.*, p. 10-12; Halle, '936 Begräbnis Heinrichs I.', p. 20. The book was published as part of the commemoration of the 1000 year anniversary of Henry's death and is primarily a summary of archaeological findings. In other publications connected to the anniversary, Henry was compared to Frederick Wilhelm I, as Otto the Great was compared to Frederick the Great: Diederichs, *Heinrich*, p. 4. This vision of the repetition of history in cycles was very popular in Germany, see for example Vowinckel, '... ein zweiter Napoleon?.'

returned.¹⁶⁰ He worked in many organizations for emigrants to Germany after 1918 and was the editor of the virulently anti-Polish weekly *Ostland*. Amongst the elite of the Nazi regime he was connected to Alfred Rosenberg and held a post in the Office of Foreign Affairs (*Außenpolitisches Amt*) of NSDAP.¹⁶¹ These sentiments led him to later write a textbook for Wehrmacht about what he called a thousand years struggle between Germany and Poland.¹⁶² Apart from this, his writing was mainly of historical fiction and poems,¹⁶³ including one about Henry, in a book dedicated to the infamous Arthur Greiser.¹⁶⁴ In the 1930s, he produced non-fiction books, of which the third was *König Heinrich I*. For Lüdtkke, as is clear from his foreword, Henry was a king principally concerned with Germany expansion into the East.¹⁶⁵ He argued that scholars were cautious when writing about Henry, and he wished to fill this perceived gap in order to show Henry as the ‘creator and leader’ of the German people.¹⁶⁶ Even though Lüdtkke claims to use a lot of scholarship and sources his ideological views dominate the text.¹⁶⁷

There is very little information available about Alfred Thoss. He studied in Berlin, Vienna, and Jena.¹⁶⁸ He could be seen as someone who could have been employed at a university, but things did not line up that way. By 1934 he was working in Rassenamt, a part of SS-Rasse- und Siedlungshauptamt (RuSHA).¹⁶⁹ He was in the SS (number 153 988) and on 9 November 1940 he became an *SS-Sturmbannführer*.¹⁷⁰ He was responsible for failed plans for

160 He held a prominent position in the Bund Deutscher Osten, cf. Haar, *Historiker*, p. 133-34. See also his short biography in Walther, ed., *Musen*, p. 193. Strangely, this biography completely omits the fact that Lüdtkke was a Nazi. It also mentions that there was a street in Bydgoszcz named after him without noting that this happened during the German occupation of the city.

161 Lüdtkke and Müller-Schwanneke, eds., *Rufer des Ostens*, p. 118.

162 Lüdtkke, *Ein Jahrtausend Krieg*. On the importance of this book for later historiography, see Strauchold, ‘Der Westgedanke’, p. 69. Lüdtkke also edited a book of propaganda about the Polish-German border: Lüdtkke and Thiele, eds., *Der Kampf um deutsches Ostland*. There is no date on the book, but it was published either in 1931 or 1933; see Fiedor, *Bund Deutscher Osten*, p. 320 – Karol Fiedor also seems confused about the nature of this publication, see p. 89-90.

163 He wrote a poem glorifying Paul von Hindenburg for a number of qualities including *furor teutonicus*, that which helped the Germans win the battle of Tannenberg; see Hoegen, *Der Held von Tannenberg*, p. 160-61. For other historical poems see Lüdtkke, *Um Weichsel und Warthe*.

164 Lüdtkke and Müller-Schwanneke, eds., *Rufer des Ostens*, p. 119-20.

165 Lüdtkke, *König*, p. 3.

166 ‘Gestalter und Führer’, Lüdtkke, *König*, p. 4-5.

167 Lüdtkke, *König*, p. 206-08.

168 The Thüringer Literaturrat webpage provides some information. He was born on 13 March 1908 at Obergrochlitz near Greiz. He studied history at Jena University and acquired the title of doctor in 1933; ‘Thüringer Literaturrat’.

169 Emberland, ‘Å stjele norsk’, p. 27 note 24.

170 Information from the online database: Najbarowski and Sadaj, ‘Numery Członków SS’.

recruiting Scandinavian citizens into the SS, as well as some research trips to ancient Germanic cult sites.¹⁷¹ During the war, he produced many works of propaganda as well as numerous articles.¹⁷² These included *Waffen-SS im Kampf vor Leningrad*, published in the series *Kriegsbücherei der deutschen Jugend*. A series aimed at a younger readership in which war was glorified, Thoss' work was the only one in the series concerned with the SS.¹⁷³ His biography of Henry was supposedly written on Himmler's order, and was published by the SS publishing house Blut und Boden.¹⁷⁴ It was a highly popular book, with two consecutive editions in 1936 and in 1943, when it was amended and expanded.¹⁷⁵ This expanded addition was produced without reference to the latest scholarship. Thoss explains in the text that he began his work in early 1942 whilst recovering from the wound he received at the Eastern Front where he was unable to read any of the new books and articles on Henry.¹⁷⁶

Thoss' book expressed the ideology of the SS and presented Henry as a forefather not only of the Reich, but also of the ideas present in Himmler's organization. In the earlier editions the importance of Henry for the NSDAP propaganda is clearly stated. Adolf Hitler is presented as the spiritual successor to the Saxon king. He continued the earlier king's style of rule and mission for the German people.¹⁷⁷ Like Henry, Hitler was to achieve peace with France and concentrate on the East.¹⁷⁸ Therefore, Hitler is following

171 Emberland, 'Å stjele norsk', p. 24-26. For general information, see Salmon, *Scandinavia and the Great Powers*, p. 208, 212; Emberland, 'Pure-Blooded Vikings', p. 114-15. Terje Emberland notes in both works that the first recruits that Thoss sent to the SS failed their exams. One was overweight, the other was flatfooted and they both had alcohol problems.

172 Thoss, 'Die Umsiedlung der Volksdeutschen'; Thoss, 'Die Umsiedlungen und Optionen'; cf. Weinreich, *Hitler's Professors*, p. 131. Thoss also wrote a booklet on the subject of German settlers in the East: Thoss, *Heimkehr der Volksdeutschen*; and Thoss and Hoffmann, *Der vierte Treck*. In June 1943 Thoss wrote a text for Himmler about sexual politics, which had the objective of presenting children born out of wedlock in a positive light. While Michael Kater saw it as an example of Himmler's bizarre ideas, it should be noted that there was a practical reason for such a study. Himmler fathered two children with Hedwig Potthast, his secretary turned lover; Kater, *Das 'Ahnenerbe' der SS 1935-1945*, p. 205; Sievers, *Tagebuch 1943*, p. 186 (entry for 16 VI 1943).

173 Thoss, *Waffen-SS im Kampf vor Leningrad*; on the series see Kuykendall, "The Unknown War".

174 Besier, 'Neo-Pagan Religiosity', p. 173.

175 One of the copies of first edition I have been able to access came from Fachschule für kindergärtnerinnen der NSDAP in Steinenhausen.

176 Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 8.

177 Thoss, *Heinrich* (1936), p. 58.

178 Thoss, *Heinrich* (1936), p. 98.

the German tradition which began with Henry's rule.¹⁷⁹ Elsewhere, Thoss argues that Hitler outlined the connection between 'blood and soil' as an important element in the creation of the state which was also realised by Henry.¹⁸⁰ There are differences between the first two editions of the book and the third one, but the ideology they propagate is the same. Here I will mainly refer to the third edition.

Both Lüttke and Thoss' books have been deemed as unhistorical and containing strange concepts.¹⁸¹ It seems that at the time Lüttke's received more criticism, even prompting Hermann Heimpel to write an article rejecting his ideas, especially his criticism of Otto.¹⁸² But as Wolfgang Giese has argued, Heimpel avoided making any criticism of Lüttke's ideology.¹⁸³ It is difficult to say whether this was because he was afraid to do so, or because he was in agreement with it.¹⁸⁴ Thoss was in many ways very crude in his ideological approach. Giese even wrote that Thoss' book was good for those people who wanted their 'hair to stand'.¹⁸⁵

What makes these books worthy of study is the fact that both authors to a large extent followed the ideological trends and scholarship of both Imperial and Weimar Germany. These books, rather than rejecting previous concepts took them to their logical extremes. This makes them difficult to study. They were expressing their belief in the fact that history legitimised Hitler and his party, but as has already been discussed above this idea that history legitimises present had already long been a part of traditional German historiography. What differentiates them from previous books is criticism of both religion and Otto I.

Even before 1933 in Germany Christianity was seen in several ways. On the one hand, it was perceived as a civilising force, one of the elements that

179 Thoss, *Heinrich* (1936), p. 126.

180 'Blut und Boden', Thoss, *Heinrich* (1936), p. 180-81.

181 Schneider, *Die neueren Anschauungen*, p. 39-42. See the very critical review by Max Buchner, who attacked both authors for their ignorance of the scholarship and Thoss for his mistakes in Latin. Buchner concluded that both books cannot substitute for Waitz's. Buchner, 'Franz Lüttke, König Heinrich I.', p. 457-64.

182 Heimpel, 'Bemerkungen zur Geschichte', p. 3-11.

183 Giese, *Heinrich*, p. 27.

184 There is some controversy over Heimpel's relationship with National Socialism. See Racine, 'Hermann Heimpel'.

185 'Die Lektüre dieses Buches kann jedem empfohlen werden, der das Bedürfnis hat, sich die Haare zu Berge stehen zu lassen', Giese, *Heinrich*, p. 26. Theodor Schieffer in his review of Walter Mohr's *König Heinrich I. 919-936* wrote that as scholars Lüttke and Thoss were not on the same level as Holtzmann and called them 'half-intellecutals' ('Halbintellektuellen'); see Schieffer, 'MOHR W., König Heinrich I.', p. 261.

created the German nation. On the other hand, particularly the Catholic church was seen as a foreign element. It was not German in its essence and was an obstacle to the creation of a more unified state. Unsurprisingly for many liberal historians, Otto von Bismarck's gradual reduction of *Kulturkampf* in the late 1870s and 1880s was seen as him betraying the cause.¹⁸⁶ Nevertheless, in national-conservative circles Christianity was seen as a way of ordering and civilising the East. Christianity was seen as part of Germanisation and the German mission of creating order in Europe. Later this idea was included as part of Nazi ideology, even though the Nazis were incredibly antagonistic towards the Church and religion.¹⁸⁷ Such contradictions were quite common in National Socialism.

There was a form of establishment response to the new Nazi scholarship. Robert Holtzmann, for example, is considered to be one of the most important scholars of the Saxon dynasty. He was the son of Heinrich Holtzmann, an evangelical theologian, which might have influenced his positive view of Christianity. In his political alignment, he was a national liberal, although his sister Adelheid Steinmann was more well known when it comes to politics.¹⁸⁸ Still, he was a historian who can be assumed to have been aware of political symbolism. For example, in 1931 he wrote a letter to a French historian advising against his visit to the meeting of the Association of German Historians in Rhineland after it was reincorporated into Germany.¹⁸⁹

In 1936 he published a biography of Otto I, which is sometimes seen as a direct response to Lüdtkke's work.¹⁹⁰ This biography begins with an introduction titled 'German Nation'.¹⁹¹ Holtzmann aimed to represent Otto as a great German leader, underlining the Germanic elements of his character and biography.¹⁹² Later on, Holtzmann produced a more in-depth look into the Saxon dynasty in *Geschichte der sächsischen Kaiserzeit*, which begins with Charlemagne, followed by an account of the disintegration of the Carolingian

186 Iggers, *The German*, p. 122-23.

187 Wolnik, *Mittelalter*, p. 120-21, passim.

188 Cf. Harvey, 'Hans Rothfels', p. 59.

189 Erdmann, *Toward a Global Community*, p. 143; cf. a remark on Hitler's rise to power made by Holtzmann during the ICHS meeting in Warsaw in 1933, p. 146. On Holtzmann, see also Fahlbusch, *Wissenschaft im Dienst der nationalsozialistischen Politik?*, p. 704-07.

190 Fried, *Zu Gast im Mittelalter*, p. 108-09.

191 'Dem deutschen Volke', Holtzmann, *Kaiser*, p. 7. On the meaning of the word Volk in those times see Makowski, *Manipulierte Sprache*, p. 200-07; cf. Wolnik, *Mittelalter*, p. 55-63, 132-34, 218-20.

192 Holtzmann, *Kaiser*, p. 7-8. Holtzmann was not alone. In his PhD thesis Heinz-Werner Frieze claimed that Otto was a real German hero in spite of the popular perception, Frieze, 'Das Bild Ottos des Großen', p. 121; cf. Diederichs, *Heinrich*.

kingdom.¹⁹³ Following this it looks at Conrad I's reign before turning to the main subject of the book, Ottonian rule up until the end of the dynasty with the death of Henry II. It concentrates on the Saxons; other lands and people appear only in connection to the Liudolfings. To a large extent, this later book presents his ideas and shows why he was in conflict with Lüdtké and Thoss' way of writing and interpreting history. Holtzmann had no problem with their nationalism, but disputed their descriptions of the Church. In his conclusions to this later book, in a section titled 'The Meaning of Saxon Empire', it is clear that Holtzmann wanted to demonstrate that there would not be a Germany and an Empire without the influence of Church and the Christian religion.¹⁹⁴ His clear aim was to dispute the claim that the Church and its clergy were constantly acting against German interests. While Holtzmann acknowledged that the Empire was larger than Germany, he still believed that it was Germany that was at the centre and was the core of it.¹⁹⁵

He was not the only historian who produced a book clearly expressing the idea that the Church was an indispensable element of Germany and the Empire. Heinrich Günter was 71 years old when he wrote a biography of Otto. He had already published a longer book about Germany in the Middle Ages.¹⁹⁶ His aim was to reply to claims about Otto and his non-German politics. His book was intended to improve the image of Otto's Germanic character, and also to defend the Church which he argued had participated in the creation of Germany. Günter's biography is of interest here. He studied in the Catholic seminary at Wilhelmsstift in Tübingen and then studied history at the university there. In the early twentieth century he had trouble with Paul Wilhelm von Keppler, the Bishop of Rottenburg, when he did not obey the proscription for lecturing about Christian legends, but he still remained committed to the Catholic Church.

Holtzmann's general study of the Saxon dynasty and Günter's book were published during World War II. When it ended, Germany was defeated and subsequently divided into two states. Both states were supposedly denazified, but it took a long time before a broader change took place in the way the German nation and its history were understood. It was only during the 1960s and later on that the notion of the ethnic nation was replaced by the construct of a community based on constitutional ideas.¹⁹⁷ German historians were supposedly able to dismiss the national ideology in the creation of a modern

193 Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 5-15.

194 'Die Bedeutung der sächsischen Kaiserzeit', Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 524-27.

195 Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 537.

196 Günter, *Das Deutsche Mittelalter*, I.

197 Iggers, 'Nationalism', p. 23.

society. Behind this there is the preconceived notion of the specialness of Germany and German experience, which to some extent is a continuation of a nineteenth century vision, where the notion of being *great* was substituted with the idea of being *guilty of the worst possible crimes*. Thus, instead of talk of bringing a German *Kultur* and glorious history to the world, nowadays there is a strong anti-nationalistic approach and an awareness of the crimes which need to be taught especially with respect to the East.¹⁹⁸

The historiography produced after 1945 is a topic that, to large extent, has not yet been described in such detail as the period which preceded it. This is mainly because those involved are still alive and as yet there has not been the space for a proper overview of the achievements and failures of more recent scholarship. Providing insight into the attitude of post war historiography towards the Saxons is the first biography of Henry appearing after 1945, which was prepared by Hellmut Diwald.¹⁹⁹ Diwald was belonged to a particular generation of German scholars. He was German born in Czechoslovakia before the war, who spent his youth in the Wehrmacht. After the war, it was some time before he found his place in the new order. He eventually became a professor at the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg in 1965 and for some time after he was a well-respected scholar. Appearing on television and newspapers, he published books (among them including biographies of great Germans) and articles.²⁰⁰ Whilst at the beginning of his career he was seen as a serious historian, after remarks in *Geschichte der Deutschen* which were seen as downplaying if not entirely dismissing the occurrence of the Holocaust, he became a much more controversial figure.²⁰¹ This was further heightened by him being influential in establishing a revisionist Zeitgeschichtliche Forschungsstelle Ingolstadt. Nevertheless, his biography of Henry was commercially a very successful book.²⁰² His outlook on historiography was distinctly pre-war, but appeared in a post war reality. Some ideological elements of his work could easily pass unnoticed, but they are clear if his work is closely examined. An example of this is his use of the word *Urwald* (that is a primeval forest), which has a direct connection to concepts of the Nazi regime.²⁰³

198 An example of such an approach is visible throughout Iggers, 'Nationalism'.

199 On Diwald see Helzel, *Ein König*, passim. Diwald, *Heinrich*.

200 Diwald, *Wallenstein*; Diwald, *Luther*.

201 It seems that sometimes the controversy was downplayed, see Engelhardt and Killy, eds., *Deutsche Biographische Enzyklopädie*, 2, p. 562.

202 Iggers, *The German*, p. 293.

203 Diwald, *Heinrich*, p. 27. It has to be added that the forest had a special meaning in German national consciousness. For a brief introduction to this subject see Zechner, 'Politicized Timber'. A prime example of its role in the Third Reich is the famous film *Ewiger Wald*.

This was a different outlook to the one which was represented by Wolfgang Giese, Gerd Althoff and other historians of the post-war era. While some, like the two names mentioned, were born just before or during the war, they were raised in the new era of a peaceful Germany. But they were connected to the old system through the influence of their teachers. They studied in German academia and their works are German in style and substance. Althoff's PhD on necrology led to the study of *memoria*, and then to the study of rituals and *amicitia* pacts. The underlying theme of his research is the attempt to prove that sources give a glimpse into the past and that by diligent inquiry it is possible to say what really took place. Thus, he tends to make many references to sources, which he translates himself, but these translations are of a somewhat dubious nature.²⁰⁴

Giese has noted that he was in a way raised with Henry. His mother sang Carl Loewe's song (with words by Johann Nepomuk Vogl) about him. Henry was also now presented in schools as the *primus inter pares* in connection with the democratization of Germany that began in 1945.²⁰⁵

Finally, there is Johannes Laudage, who was born fourteen years after the war. He was a prolific author, who was mostly interested in the German Early Middle Ages. He wrote on sources from the Ottonian times and on the investiture controversy, producing scholarship deeply rooted in the German historiographical tradition. He sadly died in 2008. Laudage's book on Otto I begins with the statement that it has been said that it is impossible to make a proper biography of Otto, as there is not enough information about him as a person. Therefore, Laudage decided to attempt to show that this was possible.²⁰⁶ He wanted to write a modern biography with a broader look at Otto. This was done not through the application of modern methodology, but rather by the rejection of the chronological approach to his life. In the end, the history is the same, but framed in a different, supposedly modern, way.

204 About Althoff's use of Latin see Kaminsky, 'Spielregeln der Politik', p. 688.

205 Giese, *Heinrich*, p. 9.

206 Laudage, *Otto*, p. 9.

Part I

The Making of a King

‘The time of powerlessness under King Conrad I.’¹

‘Henry when he took office was already 43 years old (like Adolf Hitler).’²

While Liudprand and Widukind’s accounts of Henry’s coronation are described differently, their motifs and ideology are identical. Scholars researching this topic concentrated on Widukind’s text and followed it diligently. Other sources were twisted to fit a pattern formed by Widukind’s own preconceptions about the event which took place in 919.

I will demonstrate that neither Widukind nor Liudprand were critical of Otto’s coronation or of its ritual. By examining both of these accounts I will show how, despite their being markedly different in how they describe the event, both authors portray Otto as an ultimate ruler, a son who built on his father’s earlier achievements and was ready to rise to a greater glory. He is not a reformer, but instead a continuer of the earlier achievements of Henry’s reign.

¹ ‘Die Zeit der Ohnmacht unter König Konrad I’, Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 36.

² ‘Heinrich war bei seinem Regierungsantritt (wie Adolf Hitler) bereits 43 Jahre alt’, Thoss, *Heinrich* (1936), p. 64. The reference to Hitler was removed from the later edition, see: Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 70.

1 Henry I at Fritzlar 919

The Beginning of a New Dynasty

1 King's Designation

The king on his deathbed, using the last moment of his life to point out his best successor is a scene fitting a film, or a painting, where viewers would be better able to comprehend the role of the moment.¹ While reading the description of Conrad I's death found in *Antapodosis*, it is easy to imagine such a scene; it fits perfectly the description of the typical last moments of a king.² There are tears at court, a tense wait for the king's last word that will save the kingdom, the trembling and weakening breath, and courtiers listening to the final speech of the dying monarch. This is how Liudprand describes the moment in which he introduces Henry of Saxony. This scene sets the pattern for the narration following and elevates Henry above all other *duces* in the kingdom.

When discussing Henry's election most modern scholarship has seen the competing descriptions as mostly being identical with only minor differences.³ Liudprand set the scene as follows: When Conrad felt that he was going to die, he summoned Burchard of Swabia, Eberhard of Franconia, and Giselbert of Lotharingia. Widukind, on the other hand, depicts Conrad as having been fatally wounded in a battle against Arnulf of Bavaria, with only Eberhard present.⁴ Adalbert's account refers to several nondescript 'brothers and kinsmen, that is the great men of the Franks'.⁵ Scholars have mostly brushed aside this difference. Some, like Johannes Fried, have mistakenly included Arnulf of Bavaria among the important witnesses of

1 Cf. Schmidt, *Die Förderung*, p. 81.

2 *Antapodosis* II.20. A good example of the importance of this motif is found in the *Saga Of Harald Hardrada*, which depicts the death of Edward, the King of England. He was surrounded by a small group of men including Harold Godwinson. At one moment Harold moves close to the dying monarch, listening to his voice before loudly announcing, 'I call you all to witness that the king just now gave me the kingdom and all power in England' ('Þvi skirskota ek undir alla yðr, at konungr gaf mér nú konungdóm ok alt ríki i Englandi'); Snorri Sturluson, *Haraldz saga harðráða*, c. 77; Hollander, p. 642. See also: Salvucci, "The King is Dead", p. 63-64.

3 Fried, 'Die Königserhebung', p 299, Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 37, 40-41.

4 Widukind I.25.

5 'Fratribus et cognatis suis, maioribus scilicet Francorum', Regino of Prüm ad 919; MacLean, p. 235.

the designation.⁶ In Mathilda's *Vitae* there is a description of Henry's rise with its own twist, where the question is over whether the events took place in war or peace.⁷ There is no appointment of a new king.

Looking closely at this difference in enumeration of those who may have been present during King's death, it has to be acknowledged that it alters the story's outlook and explains many problems with later parts of the narrative. For Fried this line up of witnesses based on a recollection of later coronations, specifically the coronation of Otto II, and tells us more about later times than it does about 919.⁸ I suggest otherwise, that this difference between the various lists of attendants at the designation was neither a mistake, nor a recreation of a later historical situation. Here I will concentrate on the presence of Eberhard at the coronation, while the presence of others will be discussed elsewhere.

The narratives require the presence of Conrad's brother in order to authorise the transfer of the crown and rule. For such role a woman, married to the heir, could also have been used. It is the presence of the family member who gives legitimacy to others.⁹ Eberhard legitimised the change of dynasty, hence why he was present during the coronation and why he transferred the regalia – the symbols of rule.¹⁰ In some situations such a person might make a political statement about the legitimacy of a pretender to the crown by refusing to give up the aspects of regalia, or else, as here, strengthen it by transferring them.¹¹

Conrad's is not the only designation of a successor. Giese presented a list of them from the late tenth century onwards.¹² It was used to safeguard the rule and kingship. The selection of a new ruler stabilised the kingdom in the difficult period of interregnum.¹³

6 Fried, 'Die Königserhebung', p. 298. He is not alone in this mistake: Lintzel, 'Miscellen zur Geschichte', p. 241; Schlesinger, 'Die Königserhebung', p. 217.

7 *VMrp*, c. 4; *VMra*, c. 2.

8 Fried, 'Die Königserhebung', p. 292-93, 298-300.

9 Cf. Stafford, 'Succession and Inheritance', p. 259.

10 Giese, *Heinrich*, p. 63.

11 Cubitt, 'Bishops and Succession Crises', p. 112. The act of being presented with the regalia was an important part of the succession ritual; Nelson, 'National Synods', p. 249. The fact that Eberhard personally transferred the regalia led Fried to the opinion that the designation was also a way of criticising Conradines who later opposed Otto I. See Fried, 'Die Königserhebung', p. 291-96, *passim*. Petersohn, 'Über monarchische Insignien', p. 59-63.

12 Giese, 'Zu den Designationen'; Giese, 'Designative Nachfolgeregelungen'; Giese, 'Untersuchungen zur Herrschaftsnachfolge'; Giese, 'Die Designativen Nachfolgeregelungen der Karolinger'; Giese, 'Designative Nachfolgeregelungen im Regnum Italiae'; for the Carolingian examples see: Zotz, 'Wie der Typ', p. 100-01.

13 Giese, 'Zu den Designationen', p. 182-83. Designation also appears in ancient Rome. The dominant element of creating the emperor in Ancient Roman Empire though was through acclamation; Flaig, 'Wie im Westen des Imperium', especially at p. 5.

For Fried the narrative sources concerned with Henry's rise are incorrect. The real election and emergence of Henry as a ruler of the kingdom took much more time than is implied by the sources. The role and position of Conrad's brother in Widukind's description was influenced by the ritual of coronation of Otto I.¹⁴ Following the death of Conrad, Eberhard, the natural heir to the throne, was in a difficult situation. On the one hand, he was an ideal candidate, because as the King's brother he had at least a partial claim to the title.¹⁵ On the other hand, Eberhard's power-base – Franconia – was divided and he was not the unquestioned leader of the family. Consequently, he was forced into accepting some sort of pact with someone more powerful. In the opinion of Fried, therefore Henry was chosen as part of an agreement: the crown was given in exchange for safety and power.¹⁶

This approach fails to properly address the similarities between the narratives of the designation. Since he points out the parallels between narratives about Henry and Charles the Simple, Fried is clearly aware of them, but he did not follow all of their implications.¹⁷ In the *Annales Vedastini* there is an entry under the year 898: The dying King Odo asked everyone to submit to Charles, until then his enemy. Power was transferred by the brother of the former, with Robert and other *duces* supporting the King.¹⁸

The differences between the narratives of Henry's rise are distinct. In *Antapodosis* Conrad says to the *duces* that Henry is 'both mighty in knowledge and abundantly endowed with the severity it takes for fair judgement'.¹⁹ He is chosen because of his personal qualities. He is good and judges well. Adalbert instead notes that Henry was elected because he was the best of the *duces*.²⁰ On the other hand Widukind argues that 'good luck and a suitable temperament' were no longer with the Conradines but now with

Some reference to Roman concepts appeared in texts describing Henry's rise. In *Vita Gerardi abbatis Broniensis*, c. 14 Henry becomes king through the casting of lots (*sortior*) which is described as something typical in the army. Designation of an heir did not always mean that there would be no difficulty for the successor. It could still be followed by conflict and violence. Some kings, like Offa, had great success with the extermination of rivals; Dumville, 'The Aetheling', p. 19–20.

14 Fried, 'Die Königserhebung', p. 286–88, 291–92, 311.

15 There are many examples of the brotherly succession in Anglo-Saxon England, cf. Cubitt, 'Bishops and Succession Crises', p. 119. It was however much better to be a son or a descendant in a direct line of the founder of a dynasty; Dumville, 'The Aetheling', p. 17–18.

16 Fried, 'Die Königserhebung', p. 294–96.

17 Fried, 'Die Königserhebung', p. 284.

18 *Annales Vedastini* 897–98.

19 'Is enim est et scientia pollens et iustae severitatis censurae habundans', *Antapodosis* II.20; Squatriti, p. 84.

20 Regino of Prüm ad 919.

Henry and the Saxons instead.²¹ This idea has had great traction in German scholarship. It is seen as a change of the *natio* ruling over Europe from the French Franks to the German Saxons.²² This *translatio* was demonstrating a clear line of continuity from Charlemagne to Henry, something not present in *Antapodosis*. This is owing to the different depiction of Conrad.

In Widukind's chronicle, Henry is chosen as *Dux* of Saxony after his father's death, and against Conrad's wishes²³ who lead army into the duchy, but upon seeing the strength of the Saxons united behind their *Dux*, he decided to accept the situation. This shows how Conrad was weaker than Henry.²⁴

A second attempt to overthrow Henry came soon after. The King sent Eberhard, who lost so many soldiers that he was forced to retreat. Thus, Conrad personally commands troops against the duchy, only to face a humiliating defeat.²⁵ When Conrad is besieging the city of Grona, Thietmar, a legate from Henry who, for Widukind, 'surpassed most men with his inborn shrewdness', exaggerates the strength of the oncoming Saxon army to such an extent that Conrad decides to retreat to his own lands.²⁶ This motif of cleverness was popular in medieval texts.²⁷ An army was thus defeated by one person, who knew what to say and thus frighten his enemies away. Afterwards Conrad still waged war and entered Bavaria, but he was

21 'Fortunam atque mores', Widukind I.25; Bachrach, p. 38.

22 Bühler, *Deutsche Geschichte*, p. 238-39, 241; Beumann, 'Die sakrale Legitimierung', p. 195-96; Lintzel, 'Miscellen zur Geschichte', p. 247-48; Knefelkamp, *Das Mittelalter*, p. 98; cf. Del Zotto Tozzoli, *Rosvita*, p. 35; Fried, 'Die Königserhebung', p. 268-70. The term *translatio imperii* was also used in this in connection with the imperial coronation of Otto in Rome in 962. Nevertheless, some German historians denied this interpretation, as for them Charlemagne was Karl der Grosse, Diehl, 'Heiliges Römisches Reich', p. 468-69.

23 Widukind I.21.

24 Widukind follows this with a tale about Adalbert Babenberg, who is killed after being tricked by Archbishop Hatto of Mainz (Widukind I.22). This story does not appear in every manuscript (cf. Widukind of Corvey, *Die Sachsengeschichte*, p. 30-32). Conrad and his father appear in the text and there is an indication that Conrad is at least partly to blame for the affair. Hatto also intrigued against Henry during Conrad's reign. The plan was to invite Henry to a great celebration and then kill him, but the artisan who was making the 'torque' ('torques') for the Saxon *dux* who was part of the plot informed Henry about it. 'Angry' ('iratus'), Henry sent a message (in the redaction B and C of Widukind's text) to Hatto stating that, 'Henry does not have a harder neck than Adalbert' ('quia durius collum non gerit Heinrichus quam Adelberthus', Widukind I.22; Bachrach, p. 34). The story about Adalbert also appears in a later redaction of *Antapodosis* (II.6).

25 Widukind I.23-24.

26 'Calliditate ingenita multos mortales superaret', Widukind I.24; Bachrach, p. 37.

27 Schulmeyer-Ahl, *Der Anfang*, p. 59.

fatally wounded in the battle, following which the narrative presents the designation scene.

This is not a positive description. Conrad quite clearly does not hold *potestas*. He is ridiculed by Thietmar and unable to defeat Henry in battle. Widukind undermines his and his descendants' right to rule. Liudprand, on the other hand, provides a completely different picture. His Conrad is a strong and powerful ruler, a good king able to act appropriately, albeit in what is a very short account. In these two accounts, Conrad is unable to act like a king in one, while in the other he is not only acting like a king, but also very good at it.

After Louis the Child's death, Conrad is 'ordained [...] by the whole people'.²⁸ In the second year of his rule he has to face a rebellion of the *duces* led by Henry, but thanks to his wisdom and strength, the King is able to force them to return to their allegiance. Not only are there no failed wars in Liudprand's account, but Conrad also fights and wins over all the *duces*, including Henry, and is described as 'vigorous and knowledgeable in the ways of war'.²⁹ This positive image is strengthened by the eulogy Liudprand provided: 'Truly had pallid death, which thumps its foot equally in the taverns of the poor and the towers of kings, not snatched King Conrad away so quickly, it would be he whose reputation ruled over many nations of the world.'³⁰

To see what Liudprand wanted to achieve, it is important to look at the rest of *Antapodosis*. The only other non-Saxon king who is presented in a positive light is Lambert, Wido's son. He is introduced as an 'elegant youth, and, though still an adolescent, quite warlike'.³¹ There are rebellions against him because he was a 'strict man'.³² This quality is seen in the way in which he sentences to death Maginfred, the count of Milan who took up arms against him.³³ Later on Margrave Adalbert of Tuscany and Count Hildeprand led troops against Lambert while he was hunting near Marengo. When informed about this, the King gathered a mere hundred soldiers and rode out to meet the enemy. The rebels are encamped close to the grave of the

28 'A populus ordinatur', *Antapodosis* II.17; Squatriti, p. 84.

29 'Vir strenuus bellorumque exercito doctus', *Antapodosis* II.17; Squatriti, p. 84.

30 'Verum nisi pallida mors, quae pauperum tabernas regumque turres aequo pulsat pede, Chuonradum regem tam citissime raperet, is esset, cuius nomen multis mundi nationibus imperaret'. *Antapodosis* II.20; Squatriti, p. 85.

31 'Elegantem iuvenem adhuc ephobem nimisque bellicosum', *Antapodosis* I.37; Squatriti, p. 67.

32 'Vir severus', *Antapodosis* I.37; Squatriti, p. 67.

33 *Antapodosis* I.38.

martyr Domninus and soon they all slip into drinking and singing 'frivolous songs'.³⁴ The King uses this situation to attack and he 'killed the sleepers, and slaughtered the yawners', capturing Adalbert and some of his noble followers who are imprisoned in Pavia.³⁵

Antapodosis includes two versions of Lambert's death. The first version describes how he fell from his horse during a hunt whilst chasing boars and broke his neck.³⁶ The other version (which Liudprand later wrote was the more reliable of the two, but which was unknown for many years) depicted his death as a murder. Maginfred's son Hugh, was chosen by Lambert as a companion during the hunt.³⁷ Hugh, even though received many rewards, remained treacherous, and when the tired King wished to have some rest and went to sleep, he killed him with a stick to make it look as though he died when falling of the horse. Liudprand writes that just as Judas betrayed Christ, so did Hugh, making him a proxy of Judas in the story, who is therefore labelled a 'vicar of Judas'.³⁸

The final part of the narrative, which appears in every version of *Antapodosis*, is a direct comment made towards Recemund, that Lambert was a great king, with 'honest morals, holy and awe-inspiring severity'; he had a 'magnificent body, a holy old-timers' wisdom'.³⁹ He gave more honour to the *regnum* which shows that he was a true king. This list of Lambert's great attributes ends with a note that if it was not for his sudden death, he would have been a king who could have ruled the whole world.⁴⁰

There is another similarity between Conrad and Lambert: they both died without producing an immediate heir. Conrad left his crown to Henry while Italy was captured by the rebellious Berengar. The way that Berengar's reign ended demonstrates how his capture of the crown was wrong. Flambert, who acquired many favours from Berengar, was plotting against him.⁴¹ 'Truly and without ambiguity [...] Satan entered' into Flambert.⁴² Whilst claiming

34 'Inutilia tragodimata' glossed with 'id est cantiones', *Antapodosis* I.41; Squatriti, p. 68; *tragodimata* is a transliteration of a greek τραγῳδία, cf. Liutprando de Cremona, *La Antapódosis*, p. 32, note 154 and Liutprando, *Antapodosis*, p. 421.

35 'Dormientes ferit, oscitantes iugulat', *Antapodosis* I.41; Squatriti, p. 68-69.

36 *Antapodosis* I.42.

37 Originally he was named Maginfred. Chiesa speculated that Liudprand, while correcting the text, decided to change the story; cf. Chiesa, 'Testi provvisori', p. 328 and note 23.

38 'Vicarium se Iudae', *Antapodosis* I.42; Squatriti, p. 70.

39 'Honesti morum probitas, sancta et formidolosa severitas [...] corpore splendida, mentis canities decoraverat sancta', *Antapodosis* I.44; Squatriti, p. 71.

40 *Antapodosis* I.44.

41 *Antapodosis* II.68-69.

42 'Absque ambiguitate [...] introivit in illum Sathanas', *Antapodosis* II.70; Squatriti, p. 105.

that he wanted to protect him, Flambert and his men killed Berengar in front of the church, where the stains of his blood reminded onlookers of his innocence.⁴³ Berengar died as a martyr, yet this was the result his own actions and the wrongful capture of the crown. Even a good king will fall, if he does not act as a king should.

Owing not only to their military prowess, but also their wisdom and craftiness both Conrad and Lambert were able to easily put an end to rebellions against their rule. Following Lambert's death Italy fell back into civil wars, but thanks to Henry Germany was safe against internal struggles. Liudprand saw Henry as a successor to the successful Conrad, while Widukind highlighted the transfer of the particular qualities needed to rule over the Franks and Saxons.

Recently Buc has put forward an argument that encompasses the idea of designation as a way of legitimising a change of dynasty.⁴⁴ In *Gesta Berengarii Imperatori* there are two designation scenes.⁴⁵ The first, which Dümmler has connected to Conrad's deathbed scene, is about Charles the Fat.⁴⁶ Realised that he has reached his final moments, Charles gathers his friends, points at Berengar and says that the glory moves to him and that this is connected to the (potential) power of Rome. First Italy and then the Imperial glory will belong to Berengar.⁴⁷ These final words of a dying Emperor are recalled at the panegyric's end, in a lengthy description of Berengar's coronation with the imperial crown.⁴⁸ But before that coronation could take place, a conflict emerged between Berengar and Wido, another mighty warlord in Italy.

The end of this struggle is marked by another deathbed scene. Here Wido, who long fought against Berengar, tells his son, Lambert, 'Whichever method you may find, give your recognition to Berengar, the strong. For Italy will follow him with a better fate; and he shall even lord over our lands'.⁴⁹ Both

43 *Antapodosis* II.71-72.

44 Buc, 'Noch einmal', pp. 151-78.

45 About it see, Dümmler, *Gesta Berengarii*, p. 1-60.

46 Dümmler, *Gesta Berengarii*, p. 14-15.

47 *Gesta Berengarii*, I.24-40.

48 *Gesta Berengarii*, IV.175-208.

49 'Et, ratione vales quacumque, ascissere forti / Brengario. Hunc etenim fato meliore sequetur / Hesperia, et nostris etiam dominabitur arvis', *Gesta Berengarii*, III.187-89; translation from Buc, 'Noch einmal', p. 161. Buc's translation is not the only possible reading. *Hesperia* refers to Italy, but could also be translated as 'Western Land', cf. for example Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, XIV.4.19, in which he explains that while the word can refer to Italy, it also refers more broadly to the West, specifically Italy and Spain. On this, see also Liutprando, *Antapodosis*, p. 508.

of these texts contain a scene of the dying king choosing a successor who comes from a different family.⁵⁰

The weakness of the former dynasty is an important element of these narratives. The most famous example of this is the transfer of power from the Merovingians to the Carolingians. In Einhard's narrative, first Carolingian King, Pepin the Short's reasoning for this is that the older dynasty lacked *potestas*.⁵¹ Widukind's statements on this subject are reminiscent of this notion and he gives a number of examples of the Saxon's cunning and luck lacking in the Conradines.⁵² In Liudprand's account there is no great emphasis placed on this.

Widukind wrote about this notion of fortune a second time in his discussion of Henry and King of Western Franks Charles the Simple's relationship. Recalling the history of Saint Vitus, Widukind writes that the saint's relics were moved from a place near Rome to Paris by Fulrad, Abbot of Saint Denis, in the eighth century. From there they were later moved to New Corvey in Saxony during the reign of Louis the Pious. After this the strength of the Franks diminished while that of the relics' new owners grew.⁵³ This is the same concept as seen in Conrad's speech. The context of this tale is equally important. Charles sent a message to Henry in which he attested that since the translation of the relics took place, in the kingdom of Western Franks there had only been civil wars and attacks by Vikings and Danes.⁵⁴ In Widukind's account it is a consequence of God's wishes that *fortuna* has passed to Henry and the Saxons.

Nevertheless, Pepin the Short's coronation was based on an opinion provided by the Pope.⁵⁵ In order to legalise this act, the Carolingians asked the higher authority of the Papacy for a sign that their actions are wise

50 Buc has speculated about the relationship between tales about Berengar and Henry, to the point of proposing the idea that *Antapodosis* was a reply to a work praising the former King; see Buc, 'Noch einmal', p. 164. Apart from the structural similarity, there is no evidence of Liudprand ever read *Gesta Berengarii*.

51 Einhard, *Vita Karoli*, c. 1. For the chronicler, the Merovingians were kings in name, lacking real power. They were *rex inutilis* – useless and unprofitable, or even harmful rulers. See Lapis, *Rex utilis*; Peters, 'Rex Inutilis'; Boshof, 'Die Vorstellung', p. 334.

52 Schulmeyer-Ahl, *Der Anfang*, p. 59–60.

53 Widukind I.34; cf. Becher, *Rex*, p. 52–59. Cf. also *Historia Translationis s. Viti*; Pysiak, *Król*, p. 136–37; Oberste, 'Heilige und ihre Reliquien', p. 96–97. cf. Warner, 'Saints, Pagans, War', p. 17–18.

54 Widukind I.33.

55 Becher, 'Von den Karolingern', p. 246; Faber, *Merowingowie i Karolingowie*, p. 116–17; cf. Boshof, 'Die Vorstellung', p. 335–37. The more elaborate description of this event is found in *Annales Regni Francorum*, in which Burchard, the Bishop of Würzburg and the priest Fulrad go to the Pope Zachary on Pepin the Short's order, enquiring about King Childeric III, who had the crown but possessed no real authority. The Pope's answer was that someone with genuine

and correct. At this time there were other Merovingians who could have become heirs to the crown and a legitimate king was also still alive. Conrad's decision was a voluntary one made by the dying king in order to legitimise the inevitable change of ruler by using a designation of the successor.⁵⁶

The need for the legitimisation of the change of ruler was part of the nature of rule in Germanic societies. There was a consensus of belief that the good qualities of particular kings were inherited, and thus a family line became a group of outstanding people who deserved to be rulers.⁵⁷ Such views were also clearly visible in the early nobility.⁵⁸ In the early Middle Ages kings presented themselves as the descendants of pagan Gods (like Wodan) and later of Biblical figures.⁵⁹ The idea of blood merit was an influential one and to certain extent behind the Capetians attempt to transform themselves into the Carolingians.⁶⁰ Even in the early modern period there existed the view that inheritable virtue lies in the blood.⁶¹

This idea should be seen in the context of the concept of *stirpis regiae*.⁶² Many kings who founded a new dynasty attempted to express their supposed connection to their predecessors.⁶³ The royal families of the early tenth century were still dominated by Carolingian inheritance. All the kingdoms which emerged from Frankish rule during the late ninth and early tenth century were governed by kings who were at least related if not descended from the Carolingians.⁶⁴ Alcuin wrote that royal blood strengthened a king's rule, and lamented over the dwindling numbers of those through whose veins such blood flowed.⁶⁵

royal authority should be a king and this became the basis for the coronation of Pepin; *Annales Regni Francorum* 749-50. See also, Körntgen, 'Möglichkeiten und Grenzen', p. 372-75.

56 Fried, 'Die Königserhebung', p. 302-03.

57 Lapis, *Rex utilis*, p. 18-19.

58 Leyser, 'The German Aristocracy', p. 27.

59 Davis, 'Cultural Assimilation'; cf. Gąssowska, 'Rozwój kultu'. This was connected to the idea of sacral kingship. Later on such genealogies included saints among their lists of royal ancestors; Kelly, *The New Solomon*, p. 119-29.

60 Spiegel, 'The Reditus'; Werner, 'Die Legitimität'.

61 See for example: Smith, *The Culture of Merit*, p. 72-78.

62 Lapis, *Rex utilis*, p. 18.

63 Airlie, 'The Nearly Men', p. 31. This took various forms, such as making reference to them in documents or by highlighting family ties, where a Carolingian wife was a good way of legitimising power; cf. MacLean, *Kingship and Politics*, p. 231.

64 To some extent Körntgen has argued against the notion that Carolingian blood was held in such high esteem. He argues that the Carolingians and their descendants had little impact on tenth century politics and the Carolingian blood was irrelevant to the right to rule; Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft*, p. 45 note 99.

65 *Alcuini sive Albini epistolae* 129; cf. Dumville, 'The Aetheling', p. 26.

Being a relative of the Carolingians, or else having a wife from that family, was not always sufficient to create a legal argument (in the ideological sense) for a dynastic change, but it still helped to legitimise it. The first non-Carolingian King, Boson of Provence, is a good example. His success united the Carolingians with the desire to depose him in order to avoid the precedent he set. This was followed by strong criticism of the West Frankish King Odo, who was similarly non-Carolingian, and was sometimes seen as a tyrant.⁶⁶

For the Liudolfings, who had no Carolingian blood, there was thus a difficulty in explaining their right to rule. Liutgard, Otto Magnus' sister, was the wife of Louis III, the son of Louis the German. This was certainly a great honour for the Ottonians, and gave the family some advantage, but it did not provide them with Carolingian blood.⁶⁷ Therefore, the designation holds a dual role here: it places the new dynasty in the position of being the legal heirs of the kingdom. Their rights are attested not only by their qualities, but also by the decision of the previous king. It also needs to be seen in a broader perspective. In this type of narrative there should be a depiction of the acceptance of the new king. Such a signifier legitimised the new ruler as the heir of the kingdom, one who ruled not for his own gain, but on behalf of a higher cause.⁶⁸

In the *Gesta*... Wido asks his son to take the *regalia* and surrender to the new king. In this manner Lambert lost his right to rule and acknowledged Berengar's rights. This, like Eberhard's actions, was part of the delegitimisation of the rebellion of the dead king's family, who voluntarily lost their rights to the crown without any pressure from the new monarch. For example, in *Annales Vedastini* Odo becomes king after having been sent the crown by Arnulf.⁶⁹ Such signs of kingship were important for any future ruler.⁷⁰

The signs of the legitimisation of the change of dynasty is not limited to Conrad's words or Eberhard's actions. As Hincmar of Reims has noted, the ruler also received his authority from the election, or the acceptance by the nobles and the people (with all the ambiguity inherent in this term, which while in reality referred only to the elites, in the narrative encompassed the broader community) of the kingdom, functioning as a manifestation of God's

66 Airlie, 'The Nearly Men', p. 27-28, 31.

67 Otto and Edith's daughter was named Liutgard; Bouchard, *Those of My Blood*, p. 109.

68 Weiler, 'Crown-giving', p. 73; Beumann, 'Unitas Ecclesiae', p. 552.

69 *Annales Vedastini* 888; it is also mentioned in Widukind I.29; Fried, 'Die Königserhebung', p. 303.

70 Fried, 'Die Königserhebung', p. 310-11.

will.⁷¹ All the sources describe this occurring for Henry. He was accepted by the previous king's retinue (people in the *Res Gestae*). Liudprand also describes the role of the Franks and Saxons in the creation of a new king.⁷²

Examples of this notion can be found in many texts. In his writings Julian of Toledo writing on Visigothic kingdom differentiated between a good ruler, one who takes up the office in accordance of the wishes of all the people of the kingdom, and a bad ruler who does not. The good election of Wamba is contrasted with the evil usurper *Dux* Paul, who was selected by only a single person; afterwards the army had to be persuaded to accept him as their king.⁷³ Another of Julian's examples is the usurper Hildericus of Nîmes who, when he found himself unable to force Bishop Aregius of Nîmes to betray his king and join him, forced the Bishop into exile. Later on, Hildericus accepted the anointment, not from one of the bishops of the kingdom of Visigoths, as might be expected, but instead from a Frankish bishop.⁷⁴

The roles people filled at various stages of the coronation process was not limited to that of witnesses, as in ritualised peace and/or pact arrangements.⁷⁵ They are part of what could be called a 'doubled legitimisation'. Designation was reinforced by the election and elite acceptance. This is why Liudprand and Adalbert both mentioned the presence of nobles at Conrad's death and why in Widukind and Adalbert's texts it was the people who elected the king.⁷⁶ This is a tale that explains itself. First Conrad gave the

71 Nelson, 'Hincmar of Rheims', p. 18, 24, 26.

In Byzantium an emperor was formally elected even in a case of inheritance. Even after the sacral elements were introduced to the coronation ceremony, an election was required. In the West the role of the people was not to select the monarch, but to accept him; Nelson, 'Symbols in Context', p. 270-71.

The importance of God's will is clearly seen in the Hungarian tradition. According to Hartvik, Polish *Dux* Mescio sent legates to Rome to ask for a crown. The Pope agreed, but following this he had a vision from God, in which he was informed that legates from a better people would come and that he should give the crown to their leader. Later on this story was adapted into a Polish-Hungarian chronicle. Wincenty of Kielcza adapted it from there in his *Vita S. Stanislai*. There a story which in Hungarian version was a demonstration of the greatness of the Hungarians when compared with others became a narrative of the fall and the ultimate vindication of the Polish kingdom; *Kronika Węgierskopolska*, c. 5; *Legenda Sancti Stephani regis ab Hartvico*, c. 9; Wincent of Kielcza, *Vita Sancti Stanislai Cracoviensis Episcopi (Vita Maior)*, II.27; Weiler, 'The Rex', p. 17 and note 83. On the legation for crown and discussion of reliability of this part of the chronicle see Grzesik, *Kronika węgiersko-polska*, p. 136-62.

72 For example, see *Antapodosis* II. 21.

73 Julian of Toledo, *Historia Wambae*, c. 8; de Jong, 'Adding Insult', p. 379.

74 Julian of Toledo, *Historia Wambae*, c. 6, Julian of Toledo, *The story of Wamba*, p. 186 note 41.

75 Althoff, 'The Variability', p. 74.

76 Not everyone would find such explanation to be plausible. In Karpf's opinion, when Liudprand wrote about the succession in a dynasty the people were passive. Their actions were more of

crown, and then the power of the act – the meaning of it – was accepted and strengthened by the gathered people, or specifically the gathered Saxons and Franks. In this context it is worthwhile to quote Widukind's description of the coronation of Otto I, in which he is described as 'the elect of the God who long ago was designated by Henry, the ruler of the world, and who now has been made king by all of the leaders'.⁷⁷

In the narrative the designation is followed the translation of regalia. In Adalbert's chronicle Conrad orders Henry to be given the 'sceptre and the crown and the other ornaments of royal dignity'.⁷⁸ Liudprand notes that Conrad sent 'his crown (which was not made out of gold, a metal with which almost any kind of prince shines, but which I say, was not just decorated but burdened with most precious gems), and also all his royal vestments and sceptre'.⁷⁹ In Widukind's text Conrad sends his 'insignia, the holy lance, the golden arm-bands with their cloak, the sword of the ancient kings, and crown'.⁸⁰

For Fried the appearance of the Holy Lance is evidence that Widukind's description was taken from the coronation of Otto II. The Lance was probably seized from Rudolph II of Burgundy in 926.⁸¹ Even if the date is incorrect,

a ritual rather than a real political role. On the other hand, the kings in Italy were elected by their subjects; Karpf, *Herrscherlegitimation*, p. 26, 37.

In *Antapodosis* the Italian kings are not elected, as they are usurpers invited by the people. The authority of these rulers does not stem from their subjects but rather from their brutality and firm grip on power. It is very different from the situations of both Henry and Otto, whose rule was strengthened by the support of their subjects.

77 'A Deo electum et a domino rerum Heinrich olim designatum, nunc vero a cunctis principibus regem factum', Widukind II.1; Bachrach, p. 62.

78 'Sceptrum ei et coronam caeteraque regiae dignitatis ornamenta', Regino of Prüm ad 919; MacLean, p. 235.

79 'Coronam non auro, quo poene cuiuscumque ordinis principes pollent, verum gemmis preciosissimis, non solum inquam ornatam, sed gravatam, sceptrum etiam cunctaque regalia indumenta', *Antapodosis* II.20; Squatriti, p. 84-85.

80 'His insigniis, lancea sacra, armillis aureis cum clamide et veterum gladio regum ac diademate', Widukind I.25; Bachrach, p. 38 – note, in the translation there is 'buckles' instead of 'arm-bands'; cf. Schramm, 'Salbung', p. 302-05. This list of Conrad's regalia had a counterpart in *Liber Pontificalis*, where the Lombard King Liutprand placed the following items on the altar of Saint Peter's: 'mantle, corslet, sword-belt, broad-sword and pointed sword, all gilded, and a golden crown and a silver cross' ('mantum, armilatusiam, balteum, spatam atque ensem deauratos, nenon coronam auream et crucem argenteam', this is from a later redaction of the Life of Gregory II – *Vita Gregorii* II, c. 22; Davis 2007, p. 15). Cf. Gasparri, 'Kingship', p. 109. The list of regalia remained quite constant in the German kingdom, Petersohn, 'Über monarchische Insignien', p. 54-55.

81 Fried, 'Die Königserhebung', p. 283.

it still occurred long after Henry's coronation.⁸² While at first Fried's idea seems compelling, when analysed more deeply it is less so. This is because the regalia of the first Saxon king is described differently in each of the sources. The only common element of the three texts is the crown, which only Liudprand describes in detail.⁸³

In all of these narratives the crown is a symbol of a king's rule, and the sceptre is a part of the obvious regal ornaments. Liudprand's 'royal vestments' are probably what Adalbert meant by 'ornaments of royal dignity'.⁸⁴ Overall Widukind provides a list that looks much more Saxon than do the more general entries included in Liudprand and Adalbert's accounts. The arm-band is a strange addition, as there is very little explanation of its ideological meaning.⁸⁵ Nevertheless, together with what Widukind called

82 *Antapodosis* IV.25. Percy Ernst Schramm, Hans Eberhard Mayer and Holtzmann are of an opinion that it should be correctly dated to 935; see Schramm, 'Wahl', p. 275 note 98; Mayer, 'Ein Rundschreiben', p. 514-15, 517; Holtzmann, *König*, p. 19-28, 47-48, 54.

83 Scholars have doubts about this description, and some have argued that Liudprand actually wrote about the Imperial crown; Decker-Hauff and Schramm, 'Die Reichskrone', p. 624. There are many descriptions of such richly decorated crowns. In *Gesta Berengarii Imperatoris* Berengar has 'Caesar's crown with gems and gold' ('diadema Caesar habet capiti gemmis auroque'); *Gesta Berengarii*, IV line 176-77, p. 400-01. In *In Honorem Hludowici* Ermoldus Nigellus wrote that the crown of Charlemagne, that was placed on the head of Louis the Pious was a 'golden crown with jewels' ('gemmis auroque coronam'); Ermoldus Nigellus, *In Honorem Hludowici* line 720; Noble, p. 144. According to Einhard the crown worn by Charlemagne was 'golden [...] with jewels' ('ex auro et gemmis ornatus'); Einhard, *Vita Karoli*, c. 23; Noble, p. 41; cf. Le Jan, 'Frankish', p. 289-90. This differed from the crowns of the later Carolingians, which were rather modest; Decker-Hauff and Schramm, 'Die Reichskrone', p. 624. Isidore of Seville wrote that both Roman emperors and other kings wore a crown made of gold; Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum*, XIX, 30, 3; Gasparri, 'Kingship', p. 109. In *Chronicon Salernitanum* the Lombard prince Arichis II is in conflict with Charlemagne after he wore an expensive crown. For the Emperor this signified Arichis' desire to achieve independence. *Chronicon Salernitanum*, c. 11; Gasparri, 'Kingship', p. 109. In the description of the coronation of Louis II as a King of Lombards in *Liber Pontificalis* Pope Sergius II places the 'precious crown' ('pretiosissima [...] corona') on Louis' head; *Vita Sergii II*, c. XIII; Davis 1995, p. 79; Gasparri, 'Kingship', p. 112-13. Such crowns, as Julian of Toledo shows, could later be used as a part of a means for claiming legitimacy; Julian of Toledo, *Historia Wambae*, c. 26. When Wamba captures Paul, he orders him to be crowned with a false diadem; Julian of Toledo, *Historia Wambae*, c. 30. It is clear that Paul is ridiculed by this; Julian of Toledo, *The Story of Wamba*, p. 220 note 133; Díaz Martínez, 'The Theoretical', p. 64.

It seems that a mighty kingdom required expensive signs and symbols: a crown not only of gold, but also encrusted with gems. To make the coronation stand out, the signs of *potestas* needed to look spectacular.

84 'Regalia indumenta', *Antapodosis* II.20; P. Squatriti, p. 85; 'Regiae dignitatis ornamenta', Regino of Prüm ad 919; MacLean p. 235.

85 It might have been a result of the influence of the Old Testament on the German tribes and kingdoms; Schramm, 'Baugen-armillae', p. 543; cf. Hauck, 'Halsring', p. 190-92. The *armilla* appears in all coronations described by Widukind's in *Frühdeutscher Ordo* and *Ordo der sieben*

'the sword of the ancient kings' it appeared in many other descriptions of the coronation.⁸⁶

In the Mainz *Ordo* there is an ideological explanation for the regalia. The sword is a symbol of the king's responsibility for the safety of the Church, representing one of the prerequisite virtues of a good king.⁸⁷ The weapons of a Carolingian ruler had a special meaning. In at least some pictorial representations of a ruler on a throne he is flanked by warriors who carry his weapons. In the *Codex Aureus* these weapons are marked as the weapons of Christ and they exist only to defeat God's enemies.⁸⁸

There was also an understanding that the presentation of a sword and other weapons was a symbolic adoption.⁸⁹ This extends to treating a weapon as a symbol for power over the whole realm. This includes the lance; in Gregory of Tours' *History of Franks* Guntram presents his lance to Childebert II as a symbol of designation as an heir of the kingdom.⁹⁰ Therefore, through the use of such regalia (weapons), Henry is symbolically adopted by Conrad.

The way in which regalia were obtained also had a role in their interpretation. In Julian of Toledo's history of Wamba the account of the usurper Paul's surrender to the King, sees him 't[ake] off, overwhelmed, the royal garment that he had acquired by a usurper's ambition and not by order of rank'.⁹¹

Formeln, but is not present in the West Frankish *ordo* of circa 900; see Schramm, 'Ottos I.', p. 44, cf. Schramm, 'Der Ablauf', p. 77. *Armilla* was present in older West Frankish *ordo*, but disappeared later on; Schramm, 'Baugen-armillae', p. 542-43.

86 'Veterum gladio regum', Widukind I.25; Bachrach, p. 38. Cf. *Life of Saint Oswald*, written most probably by Byrhtferth, in which Edgar is presented with the sword and the ring after the anointment, Byrhtferth of Ramsey, *Vita S. Oswaldi*, IV.7; cf. Salvador-Bello, 'Edgar', p. 257-58; Lapidge noted that Byrhtferth's description is based on a previous *ordo*; Lapidge, 'Byrhtferth', p. 70-73.

87 *Mainzer Ordo* c. 19. Cf. for the means of presenting the prerogatives of a king in Anglo-Saxon *Promissio regis*; Clayton, 'The Old English', p. 148-49.

88 Le Jan, 'Frankish', p. 281-82; *Codex Aureus*, fol 5v.

89 Le Jan, 'Frankish', p. 291-93. More on the symbolism of the father – son relationship and a sword in Le Jan, 'Apprentissages', p. 222-25.

90 Guntram also calls his nephew a son in a form of ritualized symbolical adoption; Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum*, VII.33; Gasparri, 'Kingship', p. 100; Faußner, 'Die staatsrechtliche', p. 97; cf. Schneider, *Königswahl*, p. 121-23, 224-25. On rituals in the work of Gregory of Tours see Goetz, 'Spielregeln'.

In Thietmar's chronicle there is a telling story about a lance. Count Gerhard of Alsace, who acquired from King Henry II certain *comitatus*, was robbed of the 'banner lance' ('signiferamque lanceam') signifying his control over that land, while heading home. In losing it, Gerhard not only lost the symbol, but also, the *comitatus* itself; Thietmar, *Chronik* V.21; Warner, p. 220; cf. Roach, 'Submission', p. 376-77.

91 'Regalia indumenta, quae tyrannidis ambitione potius quam ordine praeceunte perceperat, tabefactus deposuit', Julian of Toledo, *Historia Wambae*, c. 20; Martínez Pizarro, p. 208; cf. Díaz Martínez, 'The Theoretical', p. 62-68.

In the Mainz *Ordo*, there is also an 'arm-bands, cloak and ring'.⁹² While the meaning of first two items is unclear, that of the ring is clear: a symbol of faithfulness, and at the same time of power and rule over the kingdom.⁹³ The sceptre, which is absent from Widukind's list, but appears in both *Antapodosis* and *Continuation of Regino*, also has a specific meaning in the *Ordo*. It is a 'rod of virtues', which symbolizes the justice and order which are to be enforced by the king.⁹⁴

In *Casus Sancti Galli* there is another version of the narrative. As Ekkehard IV was principally concerned with the history of his monastery, it not only shows that the tale of Henry becoming king was well known, but that there was some sort of canonical version of it. While there are some differences, the main elements are the same as in the earlier accounts, and therefore this late source (written after 1034) is of key value.

In Ekkehard's version, the story is almost an adventure tale.⁹⁵ Eberhard desires the crown for himself, but Conrad, knowing that he is not a suitable person to be a ruler, initially deceives him. Later, at a point when he feels that he is dying, Conrad invites his brother to a secret discussion, when he informed Eberhard that, as he would not be accepted by the people, he should instead offer the crown to Henry. Eberhard willingly does this in secret, by covering the regalia with his cloak. After requesting a private meeting he is let into Henry's presence, and only after closing the door himself does he reveal what he has been hiding. Henry accepts the offer of the crown and Eberhard receives a reward for his actions. While Ekkehard or his source liberally used elements of the older narratives, he still retained the most important parts of the process: the designation, translation of the regalia and the acceptance of the new King by the Saxons and the Franks.

The story of Henry's rise evolved whilst remaining recognisable. While some parts changed and others were forgotten, the overall narrative essentially remained the same. It can be said that it was a well known and established tale. The differences between *Casus...* and Widukind or Liudprand's versions suggest that it is rather unlikely that there was any direct connection between them, but at the same time the similarities show that there was a set of common ideas about what happened.

Widukind and Liudprand's texts were adapted by Frutolf, who compiled both versions into a single description of Conrad's deathbed scene. Conrad

92 'Armillas et pallium et anulum', *Mainzer Ordo*, c. 20.

93 Cf. Kleinschmidt, *Untersuchungen*, p. 127-28.

94 'Virga virtutis', *Mainzer Ordo*, c. 21.

95 Ekkehard IV, *Casus Sancti Galli*, c. 49.

spoke first to all those who were gathered around him; Frutolf provides the same list as the one that appears in *Antapodosis* of those who were present and the speech is also taken from Liudprand. This is then followed by another speech, this time to Eberhard, which is taken from *Res Gestae*.⁹⁶ Interestingly elsewhere Frutolf acknowledges that there are different versions of particular events, but not in this instance.⁹⁷

While the ritual itself has been seen by some as something which actually occurred, the narrative has been perceived as improbable.⁹⁸ Strangely, it has still been seen as something that should be included in textbooks as a part of actual history, even after Fried's robust criticism of Widukind's description. It appears that belief in Widukind's narrative of events (but not in Liudprand's version) is now stronger than ever, as Althoff's book demonstrates.⁹⁹ Fried's critique provoked many attacks from those who are certain that tenth century sources can give us a glimpse of what really happened. A good example of this attitude is an article by David S. Bachrach, who accused Fried of unjustified generalisations, misusing the terminology in the context of oral history and a failure to read the literature on the subject.¹⁰⁰

Unfortunately, still no one has read Liudprand and the whole discussion lacks his narrative. As has been shown, Liudprand's version strengthens the arguments for a more sceptical approach. Only Buc gave closer consideration of *Antapodosis*, but he was satisfied with the conclusion that Liudprand's narrative is based on Berengar's *Gesta...* and did not follow that with a closer look at Widukind's narrative.¹⁰¹

Historians have approached this account with certain attitudes. Each adaptation of the Ottonian history has particular elements which are noted below. Waitz constructed an argument which was concerned only with questions to do with Conrad's election, including the reliability of Widukind's account.¹⁰² Conrad was not a successful king. His alliance with the episcopate was not what kingdom needed and was fruitless.¹⁰³

96 Frutolf, *Chronicon*, p. 179-80. This has not been accepted by Annalista Saxo whose work on the period from 741-1125 is heavily based on Ekkehard of Aura's version of Frutolf's *Chronicon universale* (Nass, *Die Reichschronik*, p. 70). In the entry about 919, he quotes Widukind (Annalista Saxo ad 919).

97 See, for example, his account of the conflict between Henry and Arnulf; Frutolf, *Chronicon*, p. 180.

98 Fried, 'Die Königserhebung', p. 302-03.

99 Althoff, *Die Ottonen*.

100 Bachrach, 'Memory', p. 63-70.

101 Buc, 'Noch einmal'.

102 Waitz, *Jahrbücher* (1885) p. 190-94.

103 Waitz, *Jahrbücher* (1885) p. 35

Waitz listed the names of those present at the deathbed scene. It seems that he followed the accounts of Widukind and Ekkehard IV, that only Eberhard was present at the deathbed. He also argued that it was the word of the dying king that prompted the Franks to elect Henry, otherwise Eberhard could have been chosen instead.¹⁰⁴

Cartellieri had no questions about reliability of the sources. Instead he presented it as an example of how Germans preserved the unity of the future Reich by acting according to Conrad's wishes. Together with the restraint of the duchies' tendencies for independence, it led to a brighter future.¹⁰⁵

Lüdtke's book contains a lot of criticism of the sources for the description of the designation. He argued that Liudprand's text is the clearest demonstration that this was a 'folk fantasy'.¹⁰⁶ Folk fantasy held a degree of respect from German scholars, as it was linked to ideas of traditional society.¹⁰⁷

Lüdtke's arguments have a strong ideological flavour in his assertion that instead of fighting enemies who were outside of his kingdom (Hungarians), Conrad fought without success against his own *duces*. These conflicts took up all of his attention and were wrong. In Lüdtke's view Conrad even profited from the Hungarian attacks, since they weakened the *duces*. His wars were a failure and he was also unable to recover Lotharingia.¹⁰⁸

In his description of the designation Lüdtke emphasised the fact that the dying King had no children and that his brother was clearly not fit to restore kingdom which was by then in decline. Burchard and Arnulf were equally unsuitable; only Henry could successfully take on a king's duties. Conrad's speech, which was taken from Widukind, makes this clear. Lüdtke also quoted Liudprand's version. From his account, it appears that the designation was the only good thing that Conrad did.¹⁰⁹

Thoss followed a similar line of argument. For him Conrad was unlucky in his wars and his failures led to the duchies displaying tendencies for independence. The kingdom was in crisis; on his deathbed Conrad realised that his policies were wrong and that he was responsible for this situation.

104 Waitz, *Jahrbücher* (1885) p. 35-36

105 Cartellieri, *Die Weltstellung*, p. 8-9.

106 'Volksphantasie', Lüdtke, *König*, p. 76-77.

107 See for example, Werner, 'On Some Examples', p. 205; *volksists* were not always held in esteem in the Third Reich; Kurlander, 'Hitler's'. On the discussion over folklorist participation in the regime see Dow and Lixfeld, 'National Socialistic' and articles from the collection Dow and Lixfeld, eds., *The Nazification*.

108 Lüdtke, *König*, p. 68-69.

109 Lüdtke, *König*, p. 74-77.

Therefore, he chose Henry, both his greatest enemy and also an enemy of the Church (the Church being responsible for almost all failures that occurred during Conrad's reign), as his successor.¹¹⁰

For Holtzmann Conrad was a weak king who lost most of the wars he fought. He was mainly concerned with fighting with his own *duces* and not with defending his kingdom. Attempting to improve his situation after failed attempts to subdue the northern *duces* Conrad moved against Bavaria. There he forced Arnulf out of his duchy and later on made a council of German bishops in Hohenaltheim on 20 September 916. But after another Hungarian attack in 917, Arnulf was able to return to Bavaria and to expel Eberhard, who was ruling it on Conrad's behalf. Conrad's attempt to regain the duchy failed, and then he died. In summarising his rule, Holtzmann noted Conrad's failure in subduing the *duces*, that the Church was under their, and not the King's, control and that he did not recover Lotharingia. The kingdom was open to Hungarian attacks because of his weakness and failed policies.¹¹¹

Describing the designation, Holtzmann wrote about the evolution of the system for electing and designating successors. After being designated by the previous ruler, the successor had to be elected in order to confirm the decision. Designation happened inside the family, as well as outside. He was also keen to note that it was understood that God had a role in the process. Those who elected the king were acting under the influence of the highest authority.¹¹²

Holtzmann was aware that Conrad's speech was a creation of Widukind. Nevertheless, the designation of Henry as a successor was an achievement for an otherwise 'unlucky king'. This was a tremendous day and losing the crown could not have occurred without some emotional undertones for Conradines; Eberhard was depicted as having tears in his eyes. Still, while the Conradines did not inherit kingdom, Eberhard nevertheless received the family's duchy.¹¹³

Diwald stated that, although among the German people the king was elected, this had nothing to do with modern ideas of democracy. Eberhard was not chosen as Conrad's successor, because of his questionable qualities. The ruler had to be elected by the nobles (*duces*).¹¹⁴ In Diwald's account of the deathbed scene, first Widukind is quoted, followed by Liudprand's version. It is clear that he was aware that at some level these versions are contradictory, but he only argued that Adalbert's text is supporting somewhat Liudprand's account.¹¹⁵

110 Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 39-41.

111 Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 60-66.

112 Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 66-67.

113 'Unglücklichen König', Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 67.

114 Diwald, *Heinrich*, p. 258, 265.

115 Diwald, *Heinrich*, p. 261-63.

Later on he attempted to combine various versions in his narrative of the designation. He noted that Conrad was not healthy enough to gather the *duces* together, therefore during the designation he is only with Eberhard. But then during Henry's coronation, the representatives of all the lands are present.¹¹⁶

Diwald calls Conrad's reign 'the most depressing decade in German history'.¹¹⁷ Depressing, not only because of his ineffective politics toward the *duces*, but also for his inability to end the Hungarian attacks. The only man who could raise the fallen churches and monasteries and defend Germany was Henry.¹¹⁸ Other *duces* could hope to become king, but only he was suitable to reign and Saxony was the only land able to provide a king for Germany. This meant that the East-Frankish kingdom effectively became Germany.¹¹⁹

Althoff generally believed the narratives about the designation and saw them as trustworthy.¹²⁰ Conrad's death was also accounted for by the failure of his policies against the *duces*. Conflict with the nobility led the kingdom to the verge of disintegration at the time of his death.¹²¹ Althoff asserted that while the statement that Conrad's greatest achievement was to designate Henry is a cynical opinion, it still had some merit.¹²² In Gebhardt's handbook Althoff came to the conclusion that while there was doubt expressed about the veracity of the narrative of the designation, it really took place that way.¹²³

In Giese's account, Conrad followed the Carolingian system of rule. While he mentioned the compliments Liudprand had for Conrad, he represented his rule as a period of unrest and Hungarian invasions. He observed that the fact that he died childless was a problem of his reign, as this invited chaos, and the kingdom's weak state led to Hungarian attack. Giese is quite aware that Widukind wrote about Henry's designation a few decades after it took place, which shows how this story dominated people's concerns. The most important element of the explanation for the choice of Henry was what Widukind called 'good luck and a suitable temperament'.¹²⁴ This idea is found not only in Widukind's text, but also in Adalbert's and Liudprand's

116 Diwald, *Heinrich*, p. 295.

117 'Ein Jahrehnt, das zu den bedrückendsten der ganzen deutschen Geschichte gehört', Diwald, *Heinrich*, p. 267.

118 Diwald, *Heinrich*, p. 268-69.

119 Diwald, *Heinrich*, p. 294-95; cf. also p. 312-13.

120 Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 38-39.

121 Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 35.

122 Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 39.

123 Althoff and Keller, *Die Zeit*, p. 116-17.

124 'Fortunam atque mores', Widukind I.25; Bachrach, p. 38.

versions. It defines Henry as a good king, one who was nevertheless met with opposition in the time between the designation and the coronation at Fritzlar. A proof for this is that there was a long interval between the designation and his coronation.¹²⁵

2 *Rex Renitens*

In *Germania*, Tacitus stated that anyone might become a commander, but a man must be born a king.¹²⁶ Similar sentiments were present in later times. They highlight just how problematic Henry's coronation was. He was from a powerful family, but had no royal blood, and no right to Conrad's inheritance. Moreover, Henry was not a Carolingian from either his father's, or from his mother's side. His wife Mathilda actually had the greater claim to ancestry, being a descendant of *Dux* Widukind, who lost a war against Charlemagne.¹²⁷ Yet, as Henry became a king; how should he behave? This question has been addressed by Björn Weiler, who proposed and promoted the term *rex renitens*.

This is a pattern of behaviour for a ruler from a new dynasty. The candidate should decline the offer of the crown and only after some time and discussion has occurred should he accept it unwillingly. It was one of the most popular and enduring concepts of the early and high Middle Ages.¹²⁸

The overall structure of the motif is following: when the king dies his retinue offer the crown to the best candidate, who refuses it and sometimes even proposes another person that, in his opinion, is much better suited for the role of ruler. Either this second choice refuses, or else there is no one in such a position, so after a while the electors return to their first candidate and resubmit their offer. This time they are successful. If he still refused, he would be punished. Robert Curthose, a failed king, was to be offered the crown of Jerusalem, but he refused. He actually fled from the Holy Land, afraid of becoming a king, and hoping to inherit the crown of England. His hopes were crushed and not only did he lose the crown of Jerusalem, he did not acquire his father's crown.¹²⁹ The *rex renitens* must not only be reluctant, but also able to accept his fate. Constant refusal might be perceived as being too proud.

¹²⁵ Giese, *Heinrich*, p. 54-60.

¹²⁶ Tacitus, *Germania* c. 7.

¹²⁷ *VMra*, c. 1. This gave Mathilda a stronger legitimacy and position of being a descendant of a great hero. On this see Schütte, *Untersuchungen*, p. 37-38.

¹²⁸ Weiler, 'The Rex', p. 14, 16, 41-42.

¹²⁹ Weiler, 'The Rex', p. 1.

The criticism of being too ambitious lies behind this concept. The good king should be one who does not want too much power and who knows his limits. If he is overly ambitious, his rule would be marked by failure. His wrongdoing would have an impact on his subjects, who would be the victims of turmoil, wars, and natural disasters. The dangers and problems for a kingdom with bad king were great. The activities of the ruler led to general distress. On the other hand, this concept also elevates the good rulers, who, by acting accordingly to the rules which were laid out, became selected by God.¹³⁰

The king's humble behaviour is not only limited to the election process, but sometimes extends further, to the refusal of anointment or wearing of the crown.¹³¹ He accepts the rule, yet he refuses to obtain the symbols of his rule. In this way he is perceived as someone who does not thirst for power. He is a ruler not for his own gain, but because he had to become one. In Julian of Toledo's account of Wamba, he accepted his anointment, but not straight after he was chosen to become a king. He waited until he reached the proper see (Toledo), where the ritual had the requisite strength and *gravitas*. Wamba was not interested in merely acquiring the crown, but he wanted to achieve it in right way. By being anointed in Toledo, Wamba's reign was further legitimized, while those who were anointed elsewhere were marked as usurpers.¹³²

In Wipo's *Deeds of Conrad* there are two examples of such humble reaction to becoming a king. In the first example it is stressed that during his election Conrad II was humble and did not forcefully put himself forward for the post.¹³³ This was later strengthened in a longer account of Conrad's procession to consecration. He was first interrupted by three people: a farmer, an orphan, and a widow. While some of his lords wanted Conrad to ignore their pleas, he waited and implicitly took care of the cases they brought up. Then another man came and said that he was exiled unlawfully. Conrad took him by the arm and went to the throne where he ordered his princes to look into this case. For all of these actions the new King was praised by Wipo.¹³⁴ This story of his willingness to postpone the ascension to power shows both his reluctance and his devotion to the obligations of a king.¹³⁵

The beginning of the *rex renitens* concept is difficult to ascertain. Buc is of the opinion that it did not first appear in Carolingian times, but was

¹³⁰ Weiler, 'The Rex', p. 26, 37-38.

¹³¹ Weiler, 'The Rex', p. 7-10.

¹³² Julian of Toledo, *Historia Wambae*, c. 3; Collins, 'Julian', p. 45-46.

¹³³ Wipo, *Gesta Chuonradi*, II.

¹³⁴ Wipo, *Gesta Chuonradi*, V.

¹³⁵ Banaszekiewicz, 'Conrad II's Theatrum Rituale'.

present in some form in antiquity.¹³⁶ Still, there is an example of this motif in Charlemagne's reluctance towards his imperial coronation in Einhard's *Vita*.¹³⁷ Weiler connects this motif with a religious interpretation; a king was similar to a priest or bishop, who should oppose consecration. A person who wanted such a post was considered to be unfit for it.¹³⁸ A king is subject to the same strictures, and should neither be too quick to acquire rule, nor desire it overmuch.¹³⁹

Rex renitens possesses quite obvious references to Boethius. He asserted that the distinct difference between good and bad people is that the former live a life full of virtue while the latter are moved by their lusts.¹⁴⁰ Obviously a *rex renitens* is one who acts for virtue.

In *Antapodosis*, when Eberhard and the *duces* came to Henry with the regalia after the designation, they asked him to become a king, but he 'humbly refused' and only after some time 'took it on without ambition'.¹⁴¹ Straight after the coronation, Arnulf, who fled to the Hungarians in order to hide from Conrad's wrath, returned to Bavaria.¹⁴² He was inspired by his retinue (nobles or advisers) to pursue the crown. In characterising Arnulf as an overly ambitious *dux*, one who clearly wants to be a king, Liudprand provides an example of behaviour which is the opposite to Henry's. This is clearly seen in the poem that is part of the tale, where Henry speaks to Arnulf: 'If the people wanted to elevate you as king, / Certainly I would be the one who desired it most'. Liudprand shows that Henry had no wish to become king, while Arnulf was 'touched by the prick of envy and wild longing'.¹⁴³ In the *Story of Wamba*, during Paul's usurpation/rebellion, when the rebels' forces were losing battles, he is asked by one of his relatives: '[W]hat good did it do you to rise against your people'.¹⁴⁴ This attempt at

136 Buc, 'Noch einmal', p. 158 note 32, cf. Collins, 'Julian', p. 43; Béranger, 'Le refus', especially p. 178-85.

137 Einhard, *Vita Karoli*, c. 28; cf. Nelson, 'Warum es so viele Versionen'.

138 Weiler, 'The Rex', p. 18-25; cf. Collins, 'Julian', p. 43.

139 Weiler, 'The Rex', p. 14, 16.

140 Boethius, *Philosophiae Consolationis*, IV.2; cf. Marenbon, *Boethius*, p. 115-16. Liudprand referenced Boethius many times in his work (*Antapodosis* I.1; Liudprandus Cremonensis, *Opera Omnia*, p. 225-26); therefore it is appropriate to see his work as following a similar philosophy. Cf. Staubach, 'Historia'.

141 'Humiliter declinavit [...] non ambitiose suscepit', *Antapodosis* II.20; Squatriti, p. 85.

142 Some expressed doubts, whether Arnulf went to the Hungarians, Holzfurtner, *Gloriosus dux*, p. 117-18. See also Reindel, 'Herzog'; Grabowski, '„Duel“'.

143 'Invidiae stimulis saevaque cupidine tactus [...] Si regem populus cuperet praeponere temet, / Protinus is essem, qui magis hoc cuperet', *Antapodosis* II. 22; Squatriti, p. 86.

144 'Quid tibi profuit contra tuos insurgere', Julian of Toledo, *Historia Wambae*, c. 20; Martínez Pizarro, p. 208.

an insult moves Paul to reconsider his position and to remove the royal vestments he was wearing. He then tried to surrender and to beg for mercy, but this was given only after he had been captured by Wamba, who then spared his life.¹⁴⁵

In *Antapodosis*, such a manifestation of humility and reluctance to become king is limited to Henry. Other rulers from new dynasties want power and kingship for which they plot or conspire to acquire. Romanos Lekapenos becomes emperor of Byzantium not only thanks to use of a force, but also through trickery of the nobility of Constantinople into giving him what he desired.¹⁴⁶ He explains that, as a protector of the young Emperor Constantine, he has the title of 'father of the emperor'; in addition his daughter is Constantine's wife. As such, he deserved a mark of his status, a symbol of power equal to his position. After such a pledge, the nobles give him the right to wear the 'red suede shoes' customarily worn by emperors. The following year he returned to the problem, arguing that now he looks laughable, since he has the legs of an emperor (thanks to the shoes) and the head of a common man. Again, he asks the nobles to either take the shoes away, or else give him a crown; they did the later.¹⁴⁷

Romanos' aim was to acquire the outer signs of rule, the regalia. While he already had real power, he also wanted to express it. This is something quite different from the proper behaviour proscribed for a king from a new dynasty. It is not strange then that Romanos ends miserably. In Liudprand's narrative the reason given for this is God's judgement. This view is expressed by him in his description of the prophecy of Romanos' fall. He used a quotation from Psalms to assert the judicial power of the Lord.¹⁴⁸ Liudprand adds later that the Emperor Romanos would be punished for his improper behaviour, in symbolically deposing the true Emperor, Constantine Porphyrogenitus, by placing him after Romanos' oldest son in the procession.¹⁴⁹

Liudprand provides other examples of ambition leading to a crime. To acquire Rome, Hugh of Arles committed himself to an incestuous relationship

145 Julian of Toledo, *Historia Wambae*, c. 20-25. Cf. Dudo of St. Quentin, *De moribus*, c. 19; Eric Christiansen rightly noted in his translation that there are similarities between Dudo's Apostrophe to Riulf and Liudprand's poem against Arnulf; Dudo, *History*, p. 200 note 245.

146 *Antapodosis* III.26, 28.

147 'Pater vassilleos [...] rubricatarum pellium caligis', *Antapodosis* III.35; Squatriti, p. 127.

148 *Antapodosis* III.35; Psalm 74 (75).9; there is a *calix vini meri plenus*, the image of a cup with wine which appears throughout Bible as a symbol of God's wrath and punishment; Peter, ed., *Pismo Święte*, 2, p. 222. Liudprand also quotes Psalm 145 (146).7-8, where judicial prerogatives of God are mentioned.

149 *Antapodosis* III.37.

with Marozia.¹⁵⁰ Berengar II used brutal force to conquer Italy.¹⁵¹ It is quite clear that in *Antapodosis* kings fail when they are too ambitious and have no humility. Arnulf of Carinthia was even punished with the awful death of being eaten by insects.¹⁵² None of the other dynasties rule for long; they all fail after only one ruler. There are only a few exceptions: Wido and his son Lambert, who died soon after becoming kings.¹⁵³ The second exception is Romanos' children, but they were deposed almost immediately after ascending the throne. Against such a background Henry and the Liudolfings are emphasised that much more as a great, and in a way ground-breaking dynasty.

In Widukind's *Res Gestae*, the account is different to that found in *Antapodosis*. After being elected, Henry refuses the anointment.¹⁵⁴ This is interpreted as a part of his creation of a different system of rule to Conrad's. According to this, Widukind's argument is that, in a similar manner to the Carolingian kings, Conrad wanted to extend his rule; he attempted to dominate and exert complete control over the other *duces*.¹⁵⁵ This is shown for example by the fact that Conrad had no *amicitia* with them.¹⁵⁶ Thus it was this failure of his manner of rule that led to Henry's designation and his different style of kingship. Henry was a *primus inter pares*.¹⁵⁷ His rule was to be based on *amicitia* pacts and interpersonal connections rather than on the domination of the king over the kingdom.¹⁵⁸

Also, worthy of consideration is the proposition that Henry refused the anointment not because of his policies towards the *duces*, but because of his attitude towards the episcopate. As the hero of a particular strain of German scholarship, Henry's opposition to the anointment shows that he was what today could be called a secular king,¹⁵⁹ and what these historians define

¹⁵⁰ *Antapodosis* III.44-45.

¹⁵¹ *Antapodosis* V.26-31.

¹⁵² *Antapodosis* I.36. On insects and their meaning, see Banaszkievicz, *Podanie*, p. 194, 200-02; cf. Banaszkievicz, 'Die Mäusethurmsage', and especially for discussion of Arnulf's case, p. 21-22.

¹⁵³ *Antapodosis* I.37.

¹⁵⁴ Widukind I.26.

¹⁵⁵ To quote Egon Boshof: 'dass er den absoluten Königstitel führte', Boshof, *Königtum und Königsherrschaft*, p. 3-4.

¹⁵⁶ Althoff, *Amicitia und pacta*, p. 18-19.

¹⁵⁷ Körntgen, *Ottonen*, p. 7-10. This interpretation appears in many books, and even in Heinrich Himmler's speech, 'Er war der Erste unter Gleichen'; Himmler, *Rede*, p. 17.

¹⁵⁸ Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 74-75.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Helzel, *Ein König*, p. 68-69; Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 27; Bühler, *Deutsche Geschichte*, p. 242-43; Fried, 'Die Königserhebung', p. 311; Schulmeyer-Ahl, *Der Anfang*, p. 346.

as a true German ruler.¹⁶⁰ Widukind is seen as a writer promoting German independence from Rome; consequently he (or Henry) was proposing a strictly German kingship. When later in his work both Henry and Otto are called *pater patriae*, it is without any Papal confirmation or acceptance.¹⁶¹ According to these scholars, *Res Gestae* depicts a new and truly German ruler, ruling without any influence from the Papacy.¹⁶²

Recently Karpf has argued that Henry's actions were directed towards Eberhard, in an effort to strengthen not only his own position but also that of the Franks. The Fritzlar ceremony was fully accepted by the Church. Thus, Henry's refusal of the anointment was not anti-religious, or anti-Church, but an action which showed that his rule came straight from Eberhard's hands. It was not an action made against the episcopate, but was for Conrad's brother, elevating the king-maker.¹⁶³ Such an interpretation helps explain why there was no negative reaction to Henry's decision, and also matches gratefulness he displayed towards Eberhard for the translation of regalia.

An even more elaborate explanation of his actions has been argued by Kerstin Schulmeyer-Ahl. The tale is part of a larger strategy of the delegitimisation of the Bavarian line of the Liudolfings. Otto I's brother Henry's claim of being born in purple had to be neutralized and consequently the sacral element of his father's rule needed to be downplayed. According to this argument, if Henry was not anointed, there is no higher standing for younger brother, as he was not the son of an anointed king. For Otto this was especially important, because he was the first Saxon ruler to be anointed. Therefore, he and his descendants became the possessors of the sacral kingship while Otto's brother lacked such a claim.¹⁶⁴ The description of the ritual would thus be an element of the politics of the Ottonian court. Henry's refusal of the anointment is thus placed in a political larger context than the smaller sphere of his actions.¹⁶⁵

These various hypotheses are not the only possible explanation for Widukind's narrative. Weiler's concept of the *rex renitens* includes not only the reluctance to accept a coronation, but can also be extended to cover a new

160 Sybel, 'Über', p. 12; Sybel wrote it for the birthday of Maximilian II, King of Bavaria. Cf. Schneider, *Die neueren Anschauungen*, p. 47-51; Münkler, *Die Deutschen*, p. 54-55. Similar sentiments are expressed in Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 27.

161 Widukind I.39; III.49.

162 Besier, 'Neo-Pagan Religiosity', p. 173-74. Cf. Eichenberger, *Patria*, p. 150-52.

163 Karpf, 'Königserhebung', p. 23.

164 Anointment legitimised Otto's rule and possibly stabilised the kingdom; Körntgen, 'Möglichkeiten und Grenzen', p. 386-68.

165 Schulmeyer-Ahl, *Der Anfang*, p. 314-15.

king's other behaviours. As noted above, sometimes a new monarch refused particular elements of kingship. This might be a lack of anointment, or it might be a refusal to wear a crown or other symbol of rule, something Saint Ladislav of Hungary did.¹⁶⁶ According to Weiler, this was intended to demonstrate the humility and humble nature of the new king. Widukind's account was understood in this manner by Thietmar of Merseburg, who acknowledged that the new ruler wanted to demonstrate humility worthy of a king, but criticised Henry for his action.¹⁶⁷ *Res Gestae* used the same concept as *Antapodosis* did, but in a different form. While the idea is the same, the different execution means that, as Weiler noted, Widukind's story fits the pattern of *rex renitens*.¹⁶⁸

While Widukind clearly wrote that Henry refused the anointment, yet also stated that he acquired his kingdom thanks to God.¹⁶⁹ In the same speech which contained his refusal, Henry stated that 'God's will' was responsible for his election to the kingship.¹⁷⁰ Helmut Beumann has used this as an example of compromise between religious ritual and politics.¹⁷¹ It would mean that although there was no anointment, Henry would still concede an acknowledgement of religion's role in his rise to power. In a way it appears in the text as a defence of the actions taken by the new king. Despite the lack of an anointment, God was nevertheless present.

There is also an earlier story by Widukind that needs to be discussed here. Following the death of Louis the Child there was no imminent heir, so the Saxons and Franks chose Henry's father, Otto Magnus, to inherit the crown. However, the old *Dux* refused and proposed Conrad of Franconia in his place, who gladly accepted it. According to Widukind, the Imperial glory was in Otto's hands.¹⁷² This tale was and is considered to be a fable that was intended to show both the importance and strength of the Liudolfings family.¹⁷³ It can also be seen as a promotion of their rule, showing that not only was Henry a powerful ruler, but so also was his father.¹⁷⁴ The explanation for Otto's refusal was that he was too old to be a king. Thus, it is clear that he was both much more powerful than Conrad and more venerated by the people.

166 *Legenda S. Ladislai regis*, c. 4; Weiler, 'The Rex', p. 8-10.

167 Thietmar, *Chronik* I.8 (5); cf. Schulmeyer-Ahl, *Der Anfang*, p. 67-68.

168 Weiler, 'The Rex', p. 8-9.

169 Widukind I.41.

170 'Divina [...] gratia', Widukind I.26; Bachrach, p. 39.

171 Beumann, 'Die sakrale Legitimierung', p. 152-53.

172 Widukind I.16.

173 Giese, *Heinrich*, p. 49, 50.

174 Cf. Beumann, 'Die sakrale Legitimierung', p. 161, 195-96.

Beumann connected this tale with the almost mythical *königsheil*, a sort of king's luck that reflected on the state of the kingdom.¹⁷⁵ Not only was Otto in possession of *königsheil*, but it also expressed the domination of the Saxons over the whole kingdom. When the crown eventually returned to the Liudolfings it was a proof of who possessed *königsheil*.¹⁷⁶

The real meaning of this tale is different. The *rex renitens* motif appears here too. Among the examples provided by Weiler is a story of Norwegian origin. When a group of outlaws wished to dethrone King Magnus Erlingsson in 1177, they offered the crown to Sverrir, but he proposed another candidate: Birgr. When he similarly refused, they returned to Sverrir and this time he accepted the crown.¹⁷⁷ Although similar, Otto Magnus' tale has a different ending. As has been observed, those rulers who demonstrated their eagerness to rule failed in their actions and this leads to a reconsideration of the depiction of Conrad in *Res Gestae*. In accordance with the scenario of *rex renitens* he should refuse the crown when it was offered to him. His decision to accept it ensured his rule was a failure. He had to fail as king, since he proved himself unfit to rule from the very beginning. In the narrative it was not the offer of the crown to Otto that was important, but rather his refusal. It was this which showed that he was the person who should be king. Conrad was in a very similar situation to Henry. He was the first ruler of a dynasty and therefore his actions should have fit a pattern, yet as has been shown, he did not do so. Therefore, his rule would end badly.

A good example of the use of *rex renitens* which corresponds directly with Widukind's tale is in much earlier *Story of Wamba*. Wamba's rise to his kingship is almost a typical example of this motif. All the people of the kingdom desire that he become king. At first Wamba refuses, first arguing that he was not competent enough for the office, and then that he was also too old to be a king. Only after some time does he succumb to the wishes of the people and accept the crown, after some people begin to threaten that they will kill him if he does not accept it.¹⁷⁸

175 Beumann, 'Die sakrale Legitimierung', p.160-61. On *königsheil* see Antonsson, *St. Magnús*, p. 197-200; Maier, *Amtsträger*, p. 66-68; Boshof, 'Die Vorstellung', p. 331-58, especially p. 343-46; Hechberger, 'Die Theorie', p. 430; Kienast, 'Germanische', p. 281-305 (for Widukind and Henry, see p. 297-99); Schlesinger, 'Herrschaft und Gefolgschaft', p. 241-42, 245; Chaney, *The Cult*, p. 7-42; Schneider, *Königswahl*, p. 204-07; for a general review of the problem, see Erkens, *Herrscher-sakralität*; Isabella, 'Das Sakralkönigtum'; cf. for a critical view of the practical visualisation of *königsheil*, see Diesenberger, 'Hair', p. 176-77, 211; for a critical view of the mythic past and *königsheil*, see Murray, 'Post vocatur'. Cf. generally Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft*, p. 18-19, 91-92.

176 Beumann, 'Die sakrale Legitimierung', p. 160-62, 195-96.

177 *Saga Sverris konungs*, c. 8-9; Weiler, 'The Rex', p. 4.

178 Julian of Toledo, *Historia Wambae*, c. 2; de Jong, 'Adding Insult', p. 379.

In Adalbert's description of Henry's rise there is no *rex renitens* motif. It appears that he was making his own interpretation of his sources and altered them to fit his views, rather than simply summarising *Antapodosis*.¹⁷⁹

Weiler, while noting that *rex renitens* was a motif used by many new dynasties, remarked that for him it appears strange that the Liudolfings needed such legitimisation of their rule almost 50 years after Henry's election.¹⁸⁰ There is an explanation for this other than the embarrassment over the way in which the crown was acquired. The last great rebellion against Otto occurred in the early 950s. While Liudprand wrote his chronicle at the point of Otto's greatest power, this was also the period just after the one of the biggest crises of his reign.¹⁸¹ It appears that in the second half of the decade there was consequently a considerable need for the legitimisation of Otto's rule and to provide a plausible explanation for his expansion outside the borders of his inherited kingdom.¹⁸²

Writing about the same time as Adalbert, Widukind approached the problem in a different way.¹⁸³ His chronicle directly addressed the rebels against Otto. While he had a somewhat sympathetic view of them, he still needed to demonstrate that their actions were wrong.¹⁸⁴ It is a problem of different aims, not of a different mentality. In Hrotsvit's *Gesta Ottonis*, Henry is a great hero and his rise had its origins in heaven. He is never in a position of *rex renitens*.¹⁸⁵ While a degree of common knowledge, or an oral history of the dynasty, certainly existed, it does not follow that each author would follow it absolutely. In Hrotsvit's poem, the praise for and exaggeration of its main heroes' achievements was more important than legitimising the dynasty's rule.¹⁸⁶

Vita Mathildis reginae antiquior is even more extreme, including hardly any description of Henry's rise to the crown. He is a great warrior, and a great man, but his becoming a king is more the consequence of fate than of

179 Lintzel, 'Studien', p. 369.

180 Weiler, 'The Rex', p. 11-12.

181 Cf. Wolf, 'Über die Hintergründe'; Althoff and Keller, *Die Zeit*, p. 193-200; Naumann, 'Rätsel'.

182 Cf. Buc, *The Dangers*, p. 19 and Buc, 'Noch einmal', p. 167.

183 Widukind of Corvey, *Die Sachsen Geschichte*, p. XXIII-XXVIII, cf. Beumann, *Widukind*, p. 178-204; Althoff, 'Widukind von Corvey', p. 258. Widukind's tale is much closer in its detail to *Antapodosis* than it is to the other sources. If the emphasis on the *rex renitens* motif is connected with the specific political situation, then it should be accepted that at least this part of the text was written in the late 950s (cf. Althoff, 'Widukind von Corvey', p. 259).

184 Bagge, *Kings*, p. 51-52.

185 Hrotsvit, *Gesta Ottonis*, 74-80.

186 Jay T. Lees has expressed doubt about the positive image of Otto, who in his opinion was inferior to his father Henry in Hrotsvit's poem; Lees, 'David', especially p. 212-13, 215.

his own agency.¹⁸⁷ He is first elected a *Dux* of Saxony after the death of his father, then following Conrad's death he 'received his sceptre and all the resources of the kingdom'.¹⁸⁸ During Otto II's reign the dynasty was firmly established, and there was little need to build a myth around Henry to explain how the Liudolfings became the rulers of Germany. This is clearly the case in a text like much later *Vita Mathildis reginae posterior*, where the description is short and Henry is ordained by God. The narration of the scene consists of only a few sentences and ends abruptly.¹⁸⁹

Frutolf's account does not initially depict Henry's reluctance. The *rex renitens* motif appears further on in the description of the first year of the king's reign, where Henry is appreciated for both his decision and action.¹⁹⁰ In Frutolf's narrative what is significant is not the refusal of the crown, but instead the refusal of the anointment.

This reading of Widukind is also strengthened by the discussion over the anointment. It was questioned if it was part of the coronation at that time. In the East-Frankish kingdom a king was previously anointed only in 899 and 911. Other rulers either were never anointed, or there is nothing known about it. Those who embarked on travel to Rome were anointed during the Imperial coronation.¹⁹¹ The year 911 is interesting as for some historians Conrad's anointment was of great importance to the society then. They noted that the bishops at the 916 Hohenaltheim council voiced many harsh words against the rebels and compared their actions to sacrilege.¹⁹²

187 *VMra*, c. 1-3.

188 'sceptrum [...] successit totaque regni facultas', *VMra*, c. 2; Gilsdorf, p. 75.

189 *VMrp*, c. 4.

190 Frutolf, *Chronicon*, p. 180.

191 Erdmann, 'Der ungesalbte', p. 318, 320; solid evidence exists only for the later anointment; MacLean, *Kingship and Politics*, p. 145; lack of an anointment did not mean that the kings were perceived as lacking divine grace, cf. Boshof, 'Die Vorstellung', p. 350. For the reasoning behind the concept of anointment and the significance of Rome in making it a part of inauguration ritual, see Angenendt, 'Rex et sacerdos'; Garrison, 'The Franks', p. 137-40. It appears that the concept of a king's anointment lost its appeal under the later Carolingians. It still took place occasionally, but it was the Papacy which was fully invested in it, repeatedly urging the Carolingians to anoint; Enright, *Iona*, p. 119-23. For Enright the concept of anointment did not come from the Papacy (p. 134), but was intended to ensure a stronger Germanic ruler. Pepin the Short did not dismiss the concepts of Merovingian rule, but attempted to strengthen the ideas which could legitimize his rule under the same system (p. 137). The important element was not the Old Testament, but the Holy Oil which was used in many rituals, such as to ensure the growth of good crops and women begetting children (p. 138-62).

192 *Hohenaltheim 20. September 916*, c. 21, 23; Boshof, 'Die Vorstellung', p. 350. On the text see Fuhrmann, 'Die Synode', for c. 21 and 23 see p. 448-52 cf. p. 461; Hellmann, 'Die Synode', p. 132-42; Hartmann, 'König', p. 100-09; Erkens, 'Konrad I.', p. 116-21; Erkens, 'Der Herrscher', p. 33-35.

Such bishops' reaction was connected with Conrad being anointed. This would show the act of anointment as one of the most important ways of strengthening the monarch's rule.¹⁹³

In the West Frankish kingdom power and rule came from the act of the anointment. The king became truly crowned only after unction.¹⁹⁴ Also, on the British Isles the anointment elevated the ruler above the status of normal human beings.¹⁹⁵ According to Hanna Vollrath-Reichelt, the anointment was introduced in the Anglo-Saxon kingdom by Offa, when he made his son Ecgrith (Egfrid) a co-ruler. It was a way of protecting the succession based on the Carolingian example.¹⁹⁶ When the anointment was introduced to the ritual of creating a new king, it soon became an indispensable part of the coronation. Not only kings profited from it, but it was also important to those who would be responsible for unction: the Church.¹⁹⁷

Widukind wrote clearly about the act of anointment in the more distant past. When Teuderic was raised to rule over the Franks, he was 'anointed'.¹⁹⁸ Widukind expressed the common connection between coronation and Church ritual, where both actions became one in the minds of the people.¹⁹⁹ In later times, the lack of anointment was unthinkable. Such an attitude is clearly visible in the *Life of Saint Udalric* by Gerhard and in Thietmar's chronicle.²⁰⁰ The metaphor of a sword without a hilt that first appeared in Gerhard's text and was later copied by Thietmar was to be about being a king without anointment. But this eventual criticism of Henry expressed by

193 Karpf, 'Königserhebung', p. 13-14.

194 Nelson, 'National Synods', p. 253.

195 More about this in Kleinschmidt, *Untersuchungen*, p. 123-26 and especially p. 125. There were two elements constituting legitimacy in the Anglo-Saxon kingdom, according to the Church: being born into the royal family and from legal marriage (Dumville, 'The Aetheling', p. 26-27). In some situations it was expanded toward the anointment; a true king had to be consecrated. It could lead to a strange situation, where to be a rightful king not only the king himself should be anointed, but his parents too (Nelson, 'Inauguration Rituals', p. 300; Yorke, 'Æthelwold', p. 77-78). For the situation in the eighth century and evidence of anointments taking place, see Story, *Carolingian*, p. 261-72. For a different view on the spread of anointment in the Anglo-Saxon England, see Jones, 'The Significance', p. 376-77.

On the other hand, sometimes consecration could sanction usurpation (Dumville, 'The Aetheling', p. 27; cf. Ullmann, *Principles*, p. 58-59). The meaning of the act and its strength depended on the context of when and how it was undertaken.

196 Vollrath-Reichelt, *Königsgedanke*, p. 35-36.

197 Nelson, 'National Synods', p. 247-48.

198 'Ungunt', Widukind I.9; Bachrach, p. 13 cf. Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft*, p. 78-79.

199 Beumann, 'Die sakrale Legitimierung', p. 153.

200 Gerhard, *Vita S. Udalrici*, I.4; Thietmar, *Chronik* I.8 (5).

Gerhard²⁰¹ should not be transferred to the beginning of the tenth century, especially, as there are other interpretations of that text.²⁰² For Hagen Keller, this was an attack on Otto creating an Empire and using the Imperial style of rule without an Imperial coronation, elements of which he observed in the proceedings of the 952 Council in Augsburg.²⁰³

It is difficult to say whether the offer of the anointment was really made. If Widukind described how it happened, would then Henry's behaviour be understood by the witnesses? Giese saw the whole scene as a part of Henry's complex strategy, where a description of this act was to be propagated.²⁰⁴ But then, why did Liudprand and Adalbert not mention it²⁰⁵ while in *Casus...* it is explicitly stated that the first Saxon king was anointed?²⁰⁶ If Henry's actions were propagated, should not all sources, or at least most of them, agree about it?

The context of Gerhard's story about the sword raises some problems with the traditional views. One night on the account of 'divine mercy' Udalric had a vision of Saint Afra dressed in beautiful clothes standing in front of him.²⁰⁷ She ordered him to rise and follow her. They went to Lechfeld, where under Saint Peter's command many saints and bishops were present. The synod was conveyed to judge *Dux* Arnulf of Bavaria, accused by 'many saints' of 'destruction of many monasteries', which he gave to secular men.²⁰⁸ Then two swords were shown and Udalric was ordered to go to Henry and say that the sword without a hilt (*capulo*) signifies that the one without 'pontifical blessing holds royal power'.²⁰⁹ Next Afra pointed to the castle, where Otto

201 Cf. Giese, 'Ensis sine capulo', p. 159-60.

202 Schulmeyer-Ahl saw it as a reference to the conflicts between the two lines of the Liudolfings; Schulmeyer-Ahl, *Der Anfang*, p. 364-65.

203 Keller, 'Das Kaisertum', p. 339-42; cf. Karpf, 'Königserhebung', p. 8. Against this, see Maleczek, 'Otto', p. 194.

204 Giese, 'Ensis sine capulo', p. 163-64.

205 Liudprand never mentions the anointment in *Antapodosis* (only in *Historia Ottonis*). It would be strange then if Liudprand explicitly stated that Henry was, or was not anointed. It seems that for him this act was completely irrelevant. The same applies to Adalbert.

206 Ekkehard IV, *Casus sancti Galli* c. 49.

207 'Divina [...] clementia', Gerhard, *Vita S. Udalrici*, I.4.1. Visions during sleep are popular motif, see Dinzelbacher, *Vision*, especially p. 39-50, 169-76; Kruger, *Dreaming*. Cf. Newman, 'Somnium'. For practical aspect of the dream visions in hagiography, clerical writing and manuscript illumination see Carty, 'The Role'.

On *Vita* see Berschin, 'Realistic Writing'.

208 'De destructione multorum monasteriorum [...] de multis sanctis accusatum', Gerhard, *Vita S. Udalrici*, I.4.15-16.

209 'Benedictione pontificali regnum tenebit', Gerhard, *Vita S. Udalrici*, I.4. This is the only place where Gerhard mentions *benedictio pontificali*.

was about to have a council with people coming from many lands and with Berengar and Adalbert from Italy. This is an obvious reference to the Augsburg council in 952. Then she showed the place where there would be a great victory of the Christians over the Hungarians. After Udalric woke up, moved by his vision, he went to the King Henry, who had already died, so Udalric became subject to Otto to whom he remained loyal. This is the only place where Arnulf appears in the text (apart from name-dropping); Henry is present in another story from *Life* in the same book, where after he saw his posture and learned about his education he was responsible for Udalric becoming the Bishop of Augsbrg.²¹⁰

It is difficult to provide an exact interpretation of the sword story, even if it was clear to the intended readers of *Life*. Walter Berschin in his edition of *Life* noted a parallel between Gerhard's text and *Vita S. Wiboradae*. There Wiborada had a dream, where Saint Gall appeared to her to express his disdain about Burchard of Swabia and his looting his lands and churches.²¹¹ In Udalric's vision, the same mechanism is used to describe Arnulf as an evil person.

It is best seen how difficult it is to interpret Gerhard's text, when medieval readings of it are considered. Most of the medieval authors saw that 'ensis sine capulo' was about Arnulf, not Henry.²¹² Even now Patrick J. Geary, who,

210 Gerhard, *Vita S. Udalrici*, I.1.110-24.

211 *Vita S. Wiboradae*, c. 25.

212 Frutolf, referencing directly Udalric's vision and his *Vita*, wrote that 'gladius sine capulo' was about Arnulf. Frutolf, *Chronicon*, p. 180. Annalista Saxo noted that some think that this sentence was about Henry, but others point at Arnulf and he swayed to the latter; Annalista Saxo ad 919. On Annalista Saxo and his use of the *Vita* see Nass, *Die Reichschronik*, p. 274-78. Otto of Freising was clear that Henry was the sword with a hilt and Arnulf the sword without; *Ottonis episcopi Frisingensis Chronica*, VI.18. See also Thomas Ebendorfer, *Chronica regum Romanorum*, p. 335. Thomas saw Otto as a great ruler and the first marks of his greatness were to be visible in his father's reign, Zimmermann, 'Die Anfänge', p. 612.

A different opinion was expressed in Thietmar, *Chronik* I.8; there is also a notable statement in *Annales Necrologici Prumienses*: 'Heinricus natione Saxo imperator, qui dictus est ensis sine capulo'. In the later revision of Udalric's life by Berno of Reichenau from early eleventh century Henry is the sword without a hilt; Berno of Reichenau, *Vita Sancti Udalrici*, c. 9; cf. for such an interpretation and setting this tale in the context of Berno's criticism towards secular people, who are almost always evil and wrong, Miller, 'Masculinity', p. 36-37. Berschin wrote that Berno had and used Gebehardus version of *Vita*, Gebehardus episcopus Augustensis, *Vita (II) S. Uodalrici*, p. 266.

As Waitz noticed in the twelfth century *Quirinalium Metelli in laudibus beati Quirini martyris* (also known as: *Miracula s. Quirini*) there is a reference there to 'ensis sine capulo'. There is a lengthy description of how Arnulf was bad because of his attacks on the churches. When he died, Bishop Udalric came and spoke about his vision. He saw two swords, one with a hilt and one without. The one without was Arnulf. The title of this part of the text is telling: 'De Arnoldo

as it seems, was not aware of the importance of this text, is of the opinion that this is an anti-Arnulf story. He notes that it was Afra who had shown Udalric the swords and that this was to say that Arnulf would not be a king.²¹³

Gerhard's *Life* was revised later by Gebehardus, who was the Bishop of Augsburg in the late tenth century. He streamlined the narration and directly stated that 'ensis sine capulo' is about Arnulf and stemmed from his ambitions and bad behaviour.²¹⁴ Summarising this, Gerhard's *Life* cannot be used as evidence for Henry's rejection of the anointment. But the most important thing is that for Widukind the key thing was that Henry became a king in a specific way. The first member of a dynasty on the throne had to be a *rex renitens*.

As the medieval narratives followed a distinct pattern, similarly modern textbooks have had their own traditions. When it comes to the coronation and the refusal of the anointment at Fritzlar, Waitz followed the sources, but discussed whether Henry – who was not anointed – was crowned and whether he wore the crown.²¹⁵ He wrote that while Conrad was anointed, it is not certain if his predecessors were. There is much of confusion surrounding the anointment and it seems that Waitz mainly wanted to present what is found in sources rather than to discuss it.²¹⁶ Without any qualms he accepted Widukind's story of Otto Magnus refusing the crown after Louis the Child's death and his urging for Conrad's election. He also wrote about the Hohenaltheim council, but was not sure why Saxon bishops had not attended.²¹⁷

More could be said about other scholars' attempts to approach this subject. According to Lüdtke, after Louis' death there were two possible candidates to the throne: Conrad and Otto Magnus. The latter was a great man, a great *dux*. In his opinion the legend about the refusal of the crown had some truth in it. Otto would not want an old man as a king after a child. This decision and his previous policies made him an enemy of, as Lüdtke called it, the Bishops' party.²¹⁸ Saxony was at that time waiting and gathering forces, to

duce, qui cenobia despoliavit, et de fine eius'; *Die Quirinalien des Metellus von Tegernsee*, p. 227-29; cf. Waitz, *Jahrbücher* (1885), p. 217-18.

213 Geary, *Living*, p. 71-72.

214 Gebehardus episcopus Augustensis, *Vita (II) S. Uodalrici*, c. 5. Giese was of the opinion that Gebehardus made a mistake here; Giese, 'Ensis sine capulo', p. 159. Berschin implies the same in a commentary to his edition of *Gebehardus episcopus Augustensis, Vita (II) S. Uodalrici*, p. 265.

215 Waitz, *Jahrbücher* (1885) p. 39-40. In *Bildersaal Deutscher Geschichte* there is no mention of a refusal of the anointment, Bär and Quensel, *Bildersaal*, p. 50.

216 Waitz, *Jahrbücher* (1885) p. 40-41, 220-21.

217 Waitz, *Jahrbücher* (1885) p. 12, 29-31.

218 Lüdtke, *König*, p. 63.

finally acquire the status of duchy from which the king came. Before that could happen, the kingdom had to be ruled by Conrad, who brought about an 'unlucky period of German history'.²¹⁹

For Lüttke, Liudprand's information that Henry at first refused the crown was a folk retelling of the past. Nevertheless, he noted that in Liudprand's times writing about such modesty and humble behaviour was common; such descriptions befitted kings, even if nothing like that happened. It was clear that Henry would not act in such a way. The discussion of the election and coronation begins with a lengthy quote from Widukind. Afterwards Lüttke wrote that one of the reasons for the refusal of the anointment could be the Church's siding with Conrad. The aim of the Hohenaltheim council was to attack the *duces* of Swabia and Bavaria. This was the reason why Saxon churchmen did not attend it. It was after the conflict between Henry and Conrad had ended, but the *Dux* was against the civil war. For him the synod's aim was also to make Germany a subject of the Church and Rome. Even so Henry's reasoning during the coronation was difficult to explain and this led Lüttke to question the presence of Heriger, who was to offer the anointment at Fritzlar. Nevertheless, while the Church disliked Henry's lack of anointment, it did not hamper his rule. The Bishops' party succumbed and accepted him as a king.²²⁰

The depiction of Henry's decision must be seen in the context of what Lüttke wrote later on. The System of the Carolingian-Conradine-Church rule of opposition towards *Stämme* was in disarray in the tenth century.²²¹ It was Henry who finally abolished it and accepted the *duces* and duchies to the point of making them the pillars of his rule. This was done with the aim of a good future for the Reich.²²²

For Thoss the only serious candidate for the crown in 911 was Otto Magnus. It is a much stronger statement than Lüttke's. The reasons for Otto's rejection of the title are similar. He stated that he was too old and therefore Conrad was chosen. But the latter was overshadowed by Hatto and the Church; he was their puppet and, what seems even worse in his text, a Frank. This is

219 'Eine neue unglückliche Spanne deutscher Geschichte', Lüttke, *König*, p. 64.

220 Lüttke, *König*, p. 72-73, 77-79.

221 *Stämme* could be translated as tribe, but like many German words, its meaning is something more. The general idea was that *Volk* was not a unified structure. It was a composite of distinct *Stämme* which were based on regional groups. They included Bavarians, Franconians, Saxons, Swabians and Thuringians. The concept was and still is hotly debated in German scholarship, whether it was an ethnic group, or one based on some other basis? A good introduction to this problem is Goetz, 'Die „deutschen Stämme“'.

222 Lüttke, *König*, p. 80-81.

why he ruled *regnum Francorum* and not Germany.²²³ Significantly, while describing Henry's coronation, Thoss wrote that Fritzlar was to be the site of a *Thing*.²²⁴ This is an example of his reverence for all ancient Germanic and *volkish* myths, where *Volk* became the dominant element in Germany. Behind this myth lay the notion that this broad ethnic community constituted a true German nation that included all people of German language and blood; that this community of people had existed since ancient times (and implicitly could be identified with the modern nation during the Nazi era). Therefore, in Thoss' construction Henry's coronation at the *Thing* became a proof of the connection to the ancient times of *volk* (people) which was not yet been changed by Christianity.²²⁵

In his narrative Henry is made into an enemy of the clergy. He represents the healthy Germanic ideas and therefore he refused the anointment. Thoss interwove his text with statements from Ranke and Carl Erdmann that were to strengthen the legitimacy of his ideas. He added that Henry's refusal of the anointment was also the rejection of Conrad's pro-Church politics and his use of the Church against the *duces*, as was seen by Thoss in the Hohenaltheim council. Henry prohibited his bishops from participating in it, as he opposed an outside influence in German affairs, which for Thoss was shown by the presence of the Pope's legates. For him Henry also rejected the Carolingian tradition.²²⁶

Holtzmann wrote about the tale of Otto Magnus as a Saxon creation and a way of enriching the ancestry of the Liudolfings.²²⁷ Similarly he was harsh about Liudprand's tale about Henry's refusal of the crown. The whole story was on the same level as the legend about Henry hunting with birds, from which the name Fowler arose. As for the anointment, Holtzmann rejected both the notion of humility and that it was a rebuff of the Universal Empire. Instead, in his opinion, the refusal was connected to the fact that Louis and Conrad were against the *duces*. Henry, wanting to act differently, refused a sign of their reign, which was strictly connected to the Church and clergy.²²⁸ Later Holtzmann wrote – without naming his source (the *Life of Saint Udalric*) – that Henry

223 Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 37.

224 Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 64.

225 This construction stood at the core of the deeply racist assumption of the superiority of the Germanic race. On this and the importance of pagan-Germanism for the movement, see among others Puschner, 'Germanenideologie' (practically the same text as Puschner, 'Die Germanenideologie'); a brief summary of the volkisch ideology is in Härtung, 'Völkische Ideologie'.

226 Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 38, 66, 68.

227 Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 58-60.

228 Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 67-69.

was afterwards criticised for this by the clergy, who ‘compared king without anointment and coronation to sword without handle’, but for him it was a ‘purely secular sword’²²⁹ and the new King distanced himself from the clergy.²³⁰ Günter connected the anointment refusal to the Hohenaltheim council.²³¹

Diwald was well aware of the importance of humility. He wrote that this was noted about Henry many times in the Middle Ages and even some sources from the twelfth century gave him the name ‘humble’.²³² He connected this with the dangers of the Hungarian attacks, even the one planned in 919. Writing about the anointment, Diwald quoted Widukind and noted Thietmar’s description. He also referred to the *Life of Saint Udalric*, but the quotation was from Thietmar’s account.²³³ As for the site of the coronation, Diwald, like Thoss, mentioned that Fritzlar was the location of the *Thing*, but at the same time he added that it was for the site of Charlemagne’s palace and where Saint Boniface established a church and monastery of Saint Peter. It was also a place where Saxon and Frankish ‘influences’ meet.²³⁴

When the refusal of the anointment took place, the Church and episcopate saw it as a great provocation that was remembered long afterwards. Henry was to make starkly different politics than Conrad and his reign did not come from the Church. In Diwald’s account, he seems almost like a secular ruler. He was to act together with *duces* and *Stämme* against the Church, while Conrad allied with the Church against them. The rejection of the anointment was a break from the established Carolingian tradition. It was so strong that because of the lack of anointment Flodoard of Reims denoted Henry as a *dux*, not a king. It would make the anointment and coronation inseparable acts.²³⁵ Therefore, Henry was depicted not as a ‘priest-king’, but as a ‘soldier-king of the German Reich’.²³⁶ Diwald even quoted Ranke’s statements about freeing Germany from the Papacy. Thoss used the same quote, but Diwald also included what Ranke wrote before it.²³⁷

For Althoff, the refusal of the anointment, which in his opinion clearly took place, had to have been previously agreed by all actors of the scene. It

229 ‘Sie verglich einen König ohne Salbung und Krönung mit einem Schwert ohne Griff [...] ein rein weltliches Schwert’, Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 70.

230 Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 70.

231 Günter, *Kaiser*, p. 12.

232 ‘Der Demütige’, Diwald, *Heinrich*, p. 290.

233 Diwald, *Heinrich*, p. 292–93.

234 ‘Einfluß’, Diwald, *Heinrich*, p. 298.

235 Diwald, *Heinrich*, p. 302–07.

236 ‘Presterkönig [...] Heerkönig des Deutschen Reiches’, Diwald, *Heinrich*, p. 307.

237 Diwald, *Heinrich*, p. 307.

was a staged public ritual that was to show those in attendance the ideas which would guide Henry in his reign. In this refusal Althoff saw an example of Henry's politics of modesty. By this the new King showed willingness to compromise with the *duces*.²³⁸ In a later book Althoff noted that while only Widukind wrote about the rejection of the anointment, it is still a viable description. Interestingly he did not note Liudprand's story about the refusal of the crown. The rejection of the anointment was a sign of reducing the spectrum and power of the king's rule and underlining the agreement between Henry and Eberhard that led to the Saxon's reign.²³⁹

When Giese wrote about the proposal of the crown to Otto Magnus, he called it a fiction not worthy of including in a biography, but explained its meaning. The offer was to elevate Henry. It made Otto Magnus the first to rise to the level of king and, after a short interregnum, this power returned to the Saxons.²⁴⁰ When finally that time came, Henry at first was the King of only Saxony and Franconia. Writing about the anointment, Giese made a point about Henry's modesty. He was later criticised for the rejection, but only a few decades after his death. The reason for this is that the refusal was prepared as a scene in which all parties participated. He dismissed the proposal that Henry's anti-Church attitude was a reason for the refusal. He followed Karpf's argument that it was a way of elevating Eberhard as the one who gave the crown to Henry and also his whole family.²⁴¹

In summary, there is a motif (*rex renitens*) and a narrative scheme that serves as the basis for Liudprand and Widukind's descriptions of Henry's rise. Both authors execute it independently. The texts are not identical when it comes to recollecting the particular events. What unites them is a certain ideological basis, which was not perceived by the modern historiography. Scholars, instead of looking closely at the meaning of the texts, left out things that did not fit what they already knew. Even more so, by selective reading they made other sources (like the *Life of Saint Udalric*), into proofs of their own constructions. The medieval narrative was mostly lost.

What is also striking is that the differences in background, with Widukind being a monk and Liudprand operating at a court without – it seems – any connection to a monastery, had no impact on their use of the motifs. Their background was less important than the intended audience and the overall concepts for each chronicle.

²³⁸ Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 43-45.

²³⁹ Althoff and Keller, *Die Zeit*, p. 118-19.

²⁴⁰ Giese, *Heinrich*, p. 49.

²⁴¹ Giese, *Heinrich*, p. 62-66.

2 Otto I at Aachen 936

A Successor – Continuator

In *Antapodosis*, while the German kingdom was under Henry's peaceful rule, the rest of the Europe was in great turmoil. Hugh of Arles was a lacklustre King of the *regnum Italiae*. Rebellions were common and if that was not enough, the nobility invited invaders into the kingdom. This was combined with wars with the Muslims who attacked and killed the Christians. It seems that great catastrophe loomed over the continent, where nothing good was seen.

But in the fourth book of Liudprand's chronicle, the great King Henry died and Otto is chosen as his successor. Many scholars saw the description of Henry's coronation as a reference or re-imagination of the events of 936 or 961. In their opinion, what happened in Fritzlar was based on later circumstances. Contrary to their opinion, the descriptions are quite different; the reasons for that will be shown below.

1 Death of a King

First Henry's death needs to be discussed. The concept of a good death, where the dying person has not only lived a good life, but also passed away peacefully, applies to this description.¹ Henry's quiet end in *Res Gestae* marks the end of the first book which was describing the rise of the powerful *dux* and later king to the position of the strongest ruler in Europe. In contrast, Liudprand placed it in the middle of a description of the fall of Europe. The context is important here. The book begins with the Italian affairs which correspond with what happened in Saxony.

King Hugh of Arles marked his son Lothar as his successor.² Henry did the same with Otto.³ Liudolfing is elevated for this deed, but for Hugh there is no praise, nor attack. While it is only a statement of fact, in its bareness it has a negative effect on the image of the Italian king. Hugh then shows that he is not as good as Henry. After his designation, he decided to acquire Rome. He tried to do so before his marriage to Marozia, but failed when her

1 Cf. Caesar of Heisterbach, *Dialogus*, XI.1.

2 *Antapodosis* IV.2.

3 *Antapodosis* IV.15.

son Alberic rebelled and forced him to retreat from the city.⁴ Hugh's attempt had nothing to do with valour or strength. It was a scheme in which his daughter Alda was to be used. She was to be given in marriage to Alberic and Hugh believed that the city would then be open to his influence and control. Instead, Marozia's son quite cunningly accepted her, but did not release Rome from his grip.

Hugh was also betrayed by his own men, who did not want him to be at peace with Alberic. When someone acted against the King, he would run away to Rome, where he was welcomed.⁵ Hugh is an example of *Antapodosis*' failed king: while he tried to act similarly to Henry, he is weak because he was unable to secure the whole kingdom. Once more he used his family as a way of acquiring alliances when he betrothed his niece Willa to Berengar of Ivrea.⁶

While, as it will be discussed later on, Henry rejected simony and called it a heresy, Hugh, in order to preserve his rule, behaved in a most shameful way. When a relative of his, Manasses – Bishop of Arles – came to Italy, Hugh gave him the bishoprics of Verona, Trident, and Mantua and later on Milan. He also became the ruler of march of Trent. Many regulations of canon law were broken. Manasses' explanation was close to being heretical; he stated that he acted like the apostle Peter, who moved to Rome after becoming Bishop of Antioch, and like Mark, who would take the Antiochian bishopric and then create other ones in Aquileia and Alexandria.⁷ Compared to Henry, Hugh is a bad king. It is somewhat similar to Buc's concept of good and bad ritual. On one side, there is a ruler who fails to act in the way that he should and on the other, a king who acts properly.

The brutal reality of Italian politics was compared to German peace and order. The dying Henry designated his son Otto as his successor.⁸ This is not however followed by the description of the coronation in Aachen. It is improbable that Liudprand did not know about this, especially as his description of Henry's last moments is quite detailed. He not only noted that the burial place was in Quedlinburg in the nunnery connected to the royal family, but also that the place of Henry's death was a *Himenlev*

4 *Antapodosis* III.45.

5 *Antapodosis* IV.3.

6 *Antapodosis* IV.8.

7 *Antapodosis* IV.6-7; cf. Leyser, 'Episcopal'. On Manasses, see: Bouchard, *Those of My Blood*, p. 88-89; Bougard, 'MANASSE'.

8 *Antapodosis* IV.15-16.

castle (Memleben).⁹ Liudprand provides more detail than Widukind, who noted only the place of the burial;¹⁰ Adalbert is little better.¹¹ *Vita Mathildis reginae antiquior* contains a longer description of Henry's death. When he was seriously ill, he gathered people in Erfurt where he discussed the state of the kingdom and then moved to Memleben and died there.¹²

In *Res Gestae*, as soon as Henry died, all the Franks and Saxons chose Otto, already designated by his father, as the next king. Then it was decided that the 'universal election' should take place at Aachen. There the *duces* and 'leading counts', all of Franks and Saxons, gathered in Charlemagne's basilica.¹³ Otto, wearing the Frankish clothes, was seated in the portico, where he received the homage from the *duces, principes*, and chiefs of the troops. By giving him their hands, they made Otto a king according to their customs. Thus, Henry's son first became a ruler by an act of secular men. It was only later followed by the Church ritual, as the *duces*, officials, clergy, and all people made a procession leading inside. Archbishop of Mainz Hildebert, called *pontifex maximus*, led Otto by hand to the centre of the church, where they were visible to everyone.¹⁴ There he said to all assembled that this was a new king, chosen by God and Henry, and if they accepted him, they should raise their right hands. Next Otto and Hildebert went to the altar, where the regalia was prepared: 'sword with a belt, a cloak with clasps, a staff with a scepter, and the crown'.¹⁵ While each of them was presented to the King, their meaning was explained: the sword was to defend the Church, the cloak with clasps were to remind him to promote the Christian faith. The staff and sceptre were to call to his mind that he should act like a father toward his subjects, to protect them and show mercy. Afterwards Otto was anointed, crowned by Hildebert and Archbishop of Cologne Wichfrid and led to a throne positioned above ('a winding stair' leading to it) between two marble columns;¹⁶ from there Otto could see

9 Liutprando de Cremona, *La Antapódosis*, p. 120 note 50. About the place of Henry's death, see also Huschner, 'Memleben', p. 467-68; Wittmann, *Im Schatten*, p. 225-26 note 801, and p. 229-30 note 813.

10 Widukind I.41.

11 Regino of Prüm ad 936.

12 *VMra*, c. 4.

13 'Universalisque electionis [...] prefectorum principes', Widukind II.1; Bachrach, p. 61-62.

14 For some, Widukind's use of this title means that he was addressing the non-Roman Empire where the Pope was substituted for a member of the German episcopate, but this has more to do with an elevated narration, than with any ideological construction; Keller, 'Widukinds', p. 397.

15 'Gladium cum balteo, clavis cum armillis, baculus cum sceptro ac diadema', Widukind II.1; Bachrach, p. 63.

16 'Cocleas', Widukind II.1; Bachrach, p. 64.

everyone and everyone could see Otto. Following this appropriate *laudes* were sung and the King moved to the palace with his men where a great feast began and the *duces* served Otto and bishops. As the banquet ended, the King gave gifts to the *duces*.

Widukind's description gives a possible explanation for Liudprand's decision to leave out an account of the coronation. *Res Gestae* was written with the aim of connecting the Ottonian dynasty with Charlemagne. Otto was crowned in Aachen. While other places could be considered, Otto was another Charlemagne and by being crowned in Aachen, he made a statement about it.¹⁷ This Frankish 'dress up' is seen not only in the place of coronation, but also in the clothes Otto wore.¹⁸ The scholars saw Aachen in the broader historical context as an attack or a reply to Louis d'Outremer's coronation. Otto chose it to show that Lotharingia was joined with his kingdom.¹⁹ This concept was propagated by Keller, but similar themes are also clearly seen in older works, such as Cartellieri's.²⁰

On the other hand, in *Antapodosis* there were no Carolingians. Liudprand completely dismissed this dynasty. He began *Antapodosis* with the death of Charles the Fat.²¹ With no need to reference the great dynasty, he was able to almost completely forget about their existence and their legacy. He is aware of their importance, as seen in some remarks, but his is largely a Carolingian free narrative.²²

They are mentioned only circumstantially; none of the rulers are marked as being a relative to Charlemagne. This is because *Antapodosis* was written to strengthen Henry and his descendants' legitimacy and their right to Empire. Thus, in *Antapodosis*, the Liudolfings were in no way disadvantaged when it comes to their not having Carolingian ancestry.²³

17 Keller, 'Widukinds', p. 431; Reindel, 'Herzog', p. 231-32.

18 Zotz, 'Wie der Typ', p. 93-94. Charlemagne wore Roman clothes for Pope Leo III; Einhard, *Vita Karoli*, c. 13. Clothes were important in the ceremony; in this case they symbolized a Carolingian vision of the kingdom. Otto would be an inheritor of Charlemagne, while Saxon clothes could be seen limiting the sphere of his influence and power to Saxony; Banaszkiewicz, *Polskie dzieje bajeczne*, p. 199-200. Giese saw in the Aachen coronation a combination of Frankish and more Germanic elements; Giese, *Der Stamm*, p. 97-100.

19 Keller, 'Widukinds', p. 426; the same idea was expressed in Diederichs, *Heinrich*, p. 9.

20 Cartellieri, *Die Weltstellung*, p. 50.

21 *Antapodosis* I.5. There is Arnulf of Carinthia, but he is never addressed as such and is presented as one of the worst rulers in the whole *Antapodosis*.

22 *Antapodosis* I.5, 14-16, II.26.

23 Grabowski, 'Liudprand z Cremony'; Buc, 'Italian Hussies', p. 220-25. Such a construction cannot be explained by the presumed lack of interest in the Carolingians in the tenth century Italy. See for example *Il Chronicon di Benedetto*, p. 96, 168.

Therefore, in *Antapodosis* there was no place for Aachen and, consequently for a description of the coronation. Even for modern scholars the relationship between the Ottonians and their predecessors are complicated. Some have even argued that only Otto III could get away with his Carolingian fascination and mark himself as a new Charlemagne, as there were no longer any true Carolingians by then.²⁴ This is why Otto was the one who opened the tomb of the great Emperor.²⁵ There was notwithstanding in documents an effort to mark Otto I as a successor of Charlemagne.²⁶

This explains the difference between Liudprand and Widukind's narrations. The former not only wrote the major part of his chronicle before the imperial coronation, but also wrote on the Italian kings, related to the Carolingian dynasty. At the same time the kings of the West-Frankish kingdom were still descendants of Charlemagne. Widukind could easily be silent about the other kings and their claims. Writing what he called a history of Europe (which it was not, as noted above), Liudprand made a selection of facts and situations to avoid the problem, while Widukind created an image of the Franks and Saxons cooperating, by underlining the familial connection between the two dynasties. He concentrated on the Ottonians as successors to the Carolingians, which was to be acknowledged by the Franks. Therefore, he stressed the unity of both dynasties.

As Liudprand did not write about any ritual of coronation in *Antapodosis*, it is possible that he omitted a description of Otto's coronation because of this. It should be added though that in general Liudprand had no interest in the cities.²⁷ Nevertheless, the coronation was such a great elevation of Otto, that it is strange that the author so keen on this subject left it out. Therefore, it is much more sensible to see in it a conscious decision coming from the perceived indifference towards the Carolingians, rather than an effect of the narrative style.

There is no description of the coronation of Otto in *Vita Mathildis reginae antiquior*, *Vita Mathildis reginae posterior*, and Adalbert's text.²⁸ For these authors, the ritual was irrelevant, as the statement that Otto was a king was enough. This attitude is nicely seen in Adalbert's account, where the beginning of Otto's rule is described simply: after Henry's death he was 'chosen as his successor with the consent of the leading men of the kingdom'.²⁹

24 Reuter, 'The Ottonians', p. 279.

25 Cf. Strzelczyk, *Otton III*, p. 139-45; Reuter, "'Regemque'", p. 372; Görich, *Otton III*, p. 265-66.

26 For example *Diplome Otto I*, no 117.

27 Sutherland, *Liudprand*, p. 12-14.

28 *VMra*, c. 4-5; *VMrp*, c. 9; Regino of Prüm ad 936.

29 'Consensu primorum regni successor eligitur', Regino of Prüm ad 936; MacLean, p. 241.

Frutolf had no problem with Aachen being the place of the coronation of the Saxon king. Any possible qualms about it were part of a time gone by. He included Widukind's description in his chronicle.³⁰ It is probably the largest chunk of text concerned with either Henry or Otto without quotes from Liudprand. Frutolf was completely satisfied with *Res Gestae*. His reasons are clear, as *Antapodosis* is rather limited compared to Widukind's excessive description.

The decision to completely ignore Liudprand's account when describing the coronation is perfectly acceptable. Nevertheless, it remains quite staggering that scholars never touched on his work which discussed it. Keller proposed Widukind's 936 as a recollection of ritual from 961.³¹ First, his description of the architecture of Aachen is so vivid, that it is highly unlikely that it was written without first-hand knowledge. While the description of the procedure and regalia is highly similar to the so called early-German *Ordo*, this is not a proof that the chronicler used it as a blueprint, as the *ordo* reused many elements of older traditions.³² Quite clearly, Widukind had some information about the coronation. He is the only source for many details and the surrounding events.³³ According to this, Widukind was a witness to the 961 coronation, as he would have been too young to witness it in 936.³⁴ This was strengthened by the absence of Edith in the description of the ritual. Normally the queen had some role during the coronation.³⁵ As Otto II was crowned alone, Widukind had no basis for depicting Edith's role in the ritual. Keller is aware that queens were not always participants in it, but for him the presence of the queen in the Mainz *Ordo* points to the depiction being taken from the later coronation.³⁶ Fried, to whom Keller's article was a reply, was of the opinion that Liudprand was present during the coronation of Otto II in Aachen.³⁷ There is a better explanation for Edith's absence. As has been noted, it was not common for a queen to be crowned.

30 Frutolf, *Chronicon*, p. 184.

31 Keller, 'Widukinds', p. 414-20; also: Laudage, *Otto*, p. 100.

32 Keller, 'Widukinds', p. 416-17.

33 These details are for example: the list of witnesses; the absence of Henry in Aachen, as he was put under a guard, Keller, 'Widukinds', p. 415.

34 Keller, 'Widukinds', p. 418.

35 Kleinschmidt, *Untersuchungen*, p. 145.

36 Keller, 'Widukinds', p. 418-20; cf. Nelson, 'The Earliest Royal Ordo', p. 351-52; Nelson, 'The Second English Ordo', p. 371.

37 Fried, 'Die Königserhebung', p. 299. Most of *Antapodosis* was written before 961. Therefore, it has to be asked on what Fried based his proposition. He was though present during Otto II's Imperial coronation in Rome in 967; see: Sutherland, *Liudprand*, p. 96-97; Huschner, *Transalpine Kommunikation*, p. 554.

Additionally, Edith is mostly absent from Widukind and Liudprand's works, as is Mathilda at Fritzlar. Why then should Edith appear?

There are many differences between Widukind and Liudprand's narratives, but there is one thing on which they agree. While Henry was *rex renitens*, Otto was already from the stock of kings. This small change makes the coronation in *Res Gestae* into a much more elevated scene. Henry had to be humble and in the narratives he is yet to prove that he is a good king. Otto was from the ruling dynasty and the motif of *rex renitens* did not apply to him. The difference between the coronations in *Antapodosis* is also present in the style of the text. Henry's is much more fleshed out, even though it is a quite basic description. In Widukind's chronicle the scenes in Aachen and at Fritzlar are two different types of narrative. Henry's rise is shortened to a few words about the Church and the offer of the anointment. Otto has a fully-fledged description, where every small detail has its place. Compared to this grandeur, Henry's coronation appears quite pale.

While in *Res gestae* the descriptions of both coronations – 919 and 936 – are different, there are some similarities, which are not in the structure but in the details. Most probably some elements of the descriptions could be based on what happened during 961, but then most of what can be seen in the chronicles is a standardised and typical narration about the coronation, only elevated and exaggerated by the author to make Otto seem even greater. It is far-fetched to say that the description of the 919 and 936 was transferred from 961. There is no definitive proof of Liudprand, or Widukind, witnessing the coronation of Otto II. The whole theory is based on assumption and the evidence is inconclusive. One example is the presence of Giselbert of Lotharingia during the designation of Henry in *Antapodosis* which was supposedly taken from 936. This is hardly a proof of the transfer of the description from a later coronation, as there are many possible explanations for the inclusion of Giselbert in the scene. All descriptions fit the common pattern of coronations. Similarities exist, but these are structural similarities that exist between the descriptions of most such rituals

The idea that descriptions of coronations were adapted from future ones is far from proven, especially as Widukind provides no description of Otto II's coronation. While he could have been a witness to it, there is other probable source of information. For this we need to look at Anglo-Saxon King Edgar's coronations. He was consecrated quite late in his rule, in 973 (he reigned from 959). For some scholars, not only Edgar was crowned many times (at least 3), but has also consecrated at least twice. The event that occurred in

Bath in 973 was not the true rise of a king, but a special crown-wearing (in the veins of *Festkronung*).³⁸

The repetition of a coronation occasionally occurred and while the proposition about Edgar was rejected by most scholars, similar acts occasionally appear in sources. The first examples can be pointed out occurred during the ninth century and the reign of either Lothar II or Charles the Bald, where the repeated coronation was connected to a new marriage. Later on, it seems that it was meant to show the act to the growing number of subjects and to reaffirm the elevated status of the ruler.³⁹ It mostly occurred during holy days, like Christmas, Easter or Pentecost.⁴⁰ According to Ernst Kantorowicz, first the king was crowned in a church by the archbishop or a bishop; later there was a procession to the second church, where there was a mass followed by a great feast.⁴¹ This description is similar to Widukind's account of Otto's coronation. During the Liudolfings' reign there are some references to actions that resemble a repeated coronation, but their reliability is doubtful.⁴²

There is more evidence for the normal *Festkronung* – the ceremonial wearing of the crown. In Thietmar's chronicle, there is a note stating that when Otto, who was not wearing a crown, was going to a church, an angel appeared before him.⁴³ Widukind wrote that Otto fasted each time he had to wear it.⁴⁴ While such material needs to be approached with caution, it seems that *Festkronung* was not unknown during Otto's time and in later sources was connected to the Ottonians. In the *Chronicle of Bohemians*, Cosmas of Prague wrote that Saint Adalbert was in such a good relationship with Otto II that during Easter in the church at Aachen, in the bishops' presence, he put the crown on the Emperor's troubled brow and celebrated

38 According to Eric John, this was proposed by Henry Gerald Richardson and Sayles in their book *The Governance of Medieval England from the Conquest to Magna Carta*; see John, 'King Edgar's', p. 277; for a lengthy critique of this proposition, see there, p. 278-89. For a different approach to the problem, see also Kleinschmidt, *Untersuchungen*, p. 173-82. On the Bath ceremony's possible imperial connotations, see Nelson, 'Inauguration Rituals', p. 296-304; against this see Jones, 'The Significance', p. 381-82.

39 Kantorowicz, *Laudes*, p. 95.

40 Cf. Klewitz, 'Die Festkrönungen', p. 65-66.

41 Kantorowicz, *Laudes*, p. 96; cf. Klewitz, 'Die Festkrönungen', p. 70-71. Cf. Brühl, 'Kronen-', especially p. 1-7, 9.

42 Kantorowicz, *Laudes*, p. 99, note 120.

43 Thietmar, *Chronik*, II.24 (16); Klewitz, 'Die Festkrönungen', p. 50-51.

44 Widukind II.36.

mass. Cosmas added that this was an exceptional honour for Adalbert, as this act was limited to the bishops.⁴⁵

There is some additional evidence of *Festkrönung* for the reign of Otto III and Henry II,⁴⁶ though stronger evidence can be found for Conrad II and his successors.⁴⁷ According to Kantorowicz the popularity of this staged ritual was a reason for producing copies of the coronation *ordo*, that were in many cathedrals, even those where there was no coronation.⁴⁸ What is also important is that in *Antapodosis* there is an act that has to be called a re-coronation, or at least crown-wearing. When Hugh of Arles was retreating from Italy, he sent his son, Lothar, to become the sole ruler of the kingdom. Before this Lothar was made a co-ruler with his father.⁴⁹ In Liudprand's text, he was later made a king again.⁵⁰ Therefore it would not be out of the question that Widukind saw such a ritualised repetition of Otto's coronation. This could just as easily be the basis for his description of 936 as the 962 ceremony. Widukind could even rely on the evidence of someone who had seen the procedure. This could be someone much younger than the people who were at Aachen in 936.⁵¹

Overall Liudprand and Widukind both created their own images of Otto. The latter image is constructed on the assumption that the new Saxon king is a spiritual reincarnation of Charlemagne. Its aim was to create ruler's positive image. The whole description of the coronation is built upon this; the presentation of regalia is aimed to show how the king will act later on. The decision to wear Frankish clothes was clearly made to point out that Otto was an heir to the great Carolingian empire.

2 Rise of the New King

Still, while Liudprand did not describe the coronation, in his narrative of Otto becoming a king there are very strong ideological elements which

45 Cosmas of Prague, *Chronica Boemorum*, I.28; it is rather about Otto III, Klewitz, 'Die Festkrönungen', p. 51.

46 Klewitz, 'Die Festkrönungen', p. 51-52.

47 Kantorowicz, *Laudes*, p. 98-99; Brühl saw the first formal German *festkrönung* with a strong proof where the king was crowned in 1158; see Brühl, 'Kronen-', p. 6-7.

48 Kantorowicz, *Laudes*, p. 96-97.

49 *Antapodosis* IV.2, V.10.

50 *Antapodosis* V.28; Buc, *The Dangers*, p. 31-32; cf. for another example of similar situation, see Brühl, 'Kronen-', p. 14-15, 26-28.

51 For Hans-Werner Klewitz the ritual of *festkrönung* was inspired by coronation in Aachen, see Klewitz, 'Die Festkrönungen', p. 67.

intended to build a specific image of Otto. This is what marks the principal difference between *Antapodosis* and *Res Gestae*, and will be highlighted here. Widukind, as noted above, wrote a great deal about political rituals and how things were staged. Therefore, he included a detailed description of the coronation. Liudprand had a different approach. The ritual takes a secondary place to ideological and symbolic concepts.

Liudprand's version begins with the statement that Henry and Mathilda had three sons: Otto, Henry, and Bruno, who was destined for Church. How great was Henry's 'prudence and how great his knowledge' could be seen by the fact that he selected Otto for his successor.⁵² This is followed with a poem dedicated to Henry I, Otto and their subjects. It begins with a statement about the death of old King, lauded as a great peacemaker. Everyone should be sad and the tears should flow at the death of Henry. Next are two verses aimed at the people, who should stop weeping, because '[a]nother arises, to be venerated the world over': Otto.⁵³ It alludes to other texts written in memory of a dead king and with hopes for a brighter future. It evokes Leo of Vercelli's poem written after the death of Otto III, which ends with the glorification of a new King, Henry II.⁵⁴ Its first part is about the qualities of the dead ruler, who is presented as the protector of the Church and a good king. With his death, chaos and evil enter the world, hence the Church and people should grieve for the loss of such a great man. But then, after the interregnum ends, a new king rises and he is destined to end all wrongdoings.⁵⁵ Therefore, in Leo's work, as well as in *Antapodosis*, there are similar concepts. A king's death needs tears and grief, the interregnum is a time of chaos – and should be as short as possible – and the rise of a new king brings hope for a better future.⁵⁶

52 'Quantae fuerit prudentiae quantaque rex Heinricus scientiae', *Antapodosis* IV.16; Squatriti, p. 151.

53 'Alter exurgit venerandus orbi', *Antapodosis* IV.16; Squatriti, p. 152.

54 Leo of Vercelli, *Versus De Ottone*; on the poem, see Bornscheuer, *Miseriae regum*, p. 169-83; Kellermann, 'Lückenbüßer?', p. 24-27. Cf. Dudo of St. Quentin, *De moribus*, c. 1. Felice Lifshitz noted that Dudo's work was meant to protect Richard I's son's rights to reign over the Normans, Lifshitz, 'Dudo's Historical Narrative'.

55 Leo reused and paraphrased his earlier *Versus de Gregorio et Ottone augusto*, Leo of Vercelli, *Versus de Gregorio*; on this, see Bornscheuer, *Miseriae regum*, p. 172; for the poem itself: Gandino, *Contemplare*, p. 77. The view that a king's death was dangerous can be well seen in *Alcuini sive Albini epistolae* 116; cf. Smith, 'The Edgar Poems', p. 122-24.

56 In the description of events surrounding Edgar the Peaceful's death in some variants of the *Anglo Saxon Chronicle* there is a long poem. He was presented in the most positive way, praised for his good character and for having the qualities of a king. In contrast with the Henry-Otto situation, his successor brings only chaos, famine and attacks on the Church. *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (C (A, B) 975; cf. Smith, 'The Edgar Poems', p. 125-37; Salvador-Bello, 'Edgar', p. 265-69.

Liudprand wrote in his poem that, '[w]hatever ended with Henry's demise / This one offers back to the people by his high birth'.⁵⁷ Otto's right to rule was based on two reasons: he was designated to be a king and was from royal family. While Henry was a great noble, Otto was the son of a king and this strengthened his position over that of his father. A king also needed to deserve the crown and Otto was described from the start as the one who had the necessary qualities.

There are many references in this poem to the *Aeneid*. Liudprand's use of Virgil's work is not only limited to the style. There are sentences in *Antapodosis* which are strikingly similar to lines in the *Aeneid*. One is a line from the poem reading 'bringing back a name known in all the galaxies' – 'nomen referens in astra'⁵⁸ – where Virgil has 'nomen in astra ferant'.⁵⁹

The context matters. In the *Aeneid*, Latinus had only a daughter, who would inherit his kingdom. Many people wanted to marry her, but the ruler had nightmarish prophetic dreams, and therefore he asked the oracle what he should do. In his poem Liudprand quoted part of the oracle's answer that Latinus should give his daughter to the newcomer Aeneas, whose descendants would rule the whole world. This similarity is strengthened by the following line in *Antapodosis*, that the subject of the poem will rule the earth.⁶⁰ Here Liudprand made a direct reference to the prophecy about the greatness of Rome. He changed it a little, as instead of an Italian city, he is referring to a Saxon dynasty. Also, Aeneas and his descendants were to bring the name to the stars ('ferant'); Otto shall bring it back ('referans').

Liudprand referred to Virgil many times. There is a diatribe against Otto's younger brother Henry that appears just two chapters after the discussed poem.⁶¹ The references are not direct; when he writes about Otto acquiring his kingship, he uses a phrase about his father Henry: '[H]e gave the sceptre'.⁶² Enzo Colonna has pointed out that this is similar to a line in *Aeneid*: 'You should have thought of that when you gave him your sceptre'.⁶³ His argument is seen more clearly in the Latin text, where 'dedit [...] sceptrā' is similar to 'sceptrā dabas'. This passage from the *Aeneid* is a part of Dido's long

57 'Quicquid Heinrici periit recessu / Praestitit claro populis hic ortu', *Antapodosis* IV.16; Squatriti, p. 152.

58 *Antapodosis* IV. 16; Squatriti, p. 152.

59 Vergilius, *Aeneid*, VII.99-101; Colonna, *Le poesie*, p. 168.

60 *Antapodosis* IV.16.

61 *Antapodosis* IV.19.

62 'Dedit is [...] sceptrā', *Antapodosis* IV.19; Squatriti, p. 153.

63 'Tum decuit, cum sceptrā dabas. — En dextra fidesque', Vergilius, *Aeneid* IV.597; Day Lewis, p. 150; Colonna, *Le poesie*, p. 179.

woe after Aeneas ran away from her. She cried about his treachery and her abandonment of her royal glory for him. Otto would be like Aeneas, a great hero. Even the following text bears a similarity to the *Aeneid*, as Liudprand wrote that: 'star-moving God [...] advised it',⁶⁴ echoing Virgil's text: 'Jupiter prompted the action'.⁶⁵ Virgil also often used the 'nunc nunc' construction that found its way into Liudprand's poem.⁶⁶ Colonna's argument is strengthened by the many uses of quotations from the *Aeneid* and other references to it throughout Liudprand's work. The chronicler clearly wanted to construct Otto as a figure similar to Aeneas, a great hero connected with Roman glory. It is of course also a metaphor for a learned audience.⁶⁷

References to the *Aeneid* in the first poem are followed by even stronger statements about Otto's rule. He will have a 'globe' under his feet which would be always under a sun, attested by the use of the classical terminology for the constellations. His rule would be stretched between Boötes and Hesper, Lucifer, and Eos. The poem's finale references a line before, that Otto will be 'venerated the world over'.⁶⁸ Liudprand's main concern was to build an image of a ruler, who stands out amongst others in Europe. Eos here might be a reference not only to the east, but also specifically to the Byzantine Empire. In such an understanding, Otto should be treated as an equal with the rulers of Constantinople. Also, Hesper is not without a possible double meaning; as already been noted, it was a name used for the West and for Italy, and according to Karpf, it could be read as a reference to attempts to conquer the peninsula in the later 950s.⁶⁹

This is another difference between narrations: in *Antapodosis*, Otto was a king from birth and his position was later strengthened through his designation. There is no election, or even acceptance of his rule. He is a king by his own greatness and only proves that he deserves the crown. In *Res Gestae* his rule was based not only on the words of the dying Henry, but also the people gathered during his coronation.⁷⁰ Scholars have never investigated this difference in description. This difference highlights the notion that Widukind's description was much more grounded in the political rituals of making a king, while Liudprand's was more concerned with ideological and symbolic concepts.

64 'Monebat / Astripotens [...] Deus', *Antapodosis* IV.19; Squatriti, p. 153.

65 'Sic Iuppiter ipse monebat', Vergilius, *Aeneid* VII.110; Day Lewis, p. 199.

66 Colonna, *Le poesie*, p. 179.

67 Cf. Giovini, 'I viaggi', p. 781.

68 'Venerandus orbi [...] orbem', *Antapodosis* IV.16; Squatriti, p. 152.

69 Karpf, *Herrscherlegitimation*, p. 26-27, 40.

70 Widukind II.1.

To flesh this out, it is important to remember that Liudprand wrote about the designation of Lothar by Hugh of Arles, where a father pointed at his son as his successor.⁷¹ It seems that the difference in outcome of the designation was not intended as questioning the legitimacy of the Italian ruler; instead he questioned his *fortuna*.⁷² The future marriage of both kingdoms would combine the legitimacy of the Italian dynasty with the Liudolfings' qualities. In this way, it seems that Liudprand gave a reason for southern expansion, without addressing it directly.⁷³

Lothar's designation is the only one in the Italian kingdom. Liudprand, while he attacked Hugh of Arles vehemently, never identified him as an illegal king. His first attempt to acquire the title was a failure because 'his time for ruling had not yet come'.⁷⁴ In other words, after some years his time did come and he became a king. He was a legal and rightful ruler, his designated son was also a legitimate king, and Adelheid inherited the right to the crown.

In summary, it is important to note that in Ermoldus Nigellus's *In honor of Louis* Pope Stephen IV compared Charlemagne and Louis to David and Solomon. The former, while being a great king, was outshone by his own son.⁷⁵ The same thing happened in the Ottonians' case.⁷⁶

71 Cf. Buc, *The Dangers*, p. 323-26.

72 Cf. *Antapodosis* V.28; Buc, *The Dangers*, p. 31-34, where Liudprand's tale is put in the context of good and bad rituals. Nevertheless, while Lothar was tricked into a bad ritual, his intentions and legitimacy were never questioned.

73 In *Antapodosis* there is no direct reference to Saxon expansion in Italy. Widukind wrote that Henry, after subduing all the neighbours of his kingdom, wanted to go to Rome (Widukind I.40). It happened just before his death and the weakness of his body prohibited him from embarking on the journey. Some have doubts about the meaning of this information, or are otherwise sceptical, like Giese, *Heinrich*, p. 164-68; Johannes Bühler on the other hand saw some truth in the text; Bühler, *Deutsche Geschichte*, p. 250; cf. Jordan, 'III. Deutsches Reich', p. 14; doubt is seen in Althoff and Keller, *Die Zeit*, p. 145. Werner Maleczek saw it as probably being a religious pilgrimage; Maleczek, 'Otto', p. 179; Wolf pointed at the good relations between Hugh of Arles and Henry as an argument against any plans for conquest and imperial coronation and therefore the pilgrimage is much more probable; Wolf, 'König', p. 39-40, 43-45. Of the opinion that Henry wanted to acquire the imperial crown, see Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 104-05.

It seems that Liudprand was writing about the possible conquest of Italy in a much more thinly veiled way. *Antapodosis* was written after Otto had married Adelheid, Lothar's widow (cf. Maleczek, 'Otto', p. 186-87; Keller, 'Otto', p. 226-27) and was one of the legal arguments for conquest as an heiress to the crown (Weinfurter, 'Kaiserin Adelheid', p. 9-10; cf. Odilo of Cluny, *Epitaphium Adelheidae*, c. 2). This right is also confirmed by the plans of Berengar II to wed her to his son and co-ruler, Adalbert (Wolf, 'Über die Hintergründe', p. 59; Fasoli, *Ire*, p. 172). Against this, see Vignodelli, 'Imperial Blood'.

74 'Regnandi tempus ei nondum advenerat', *Antapodosis* III.12; Squatriti, p. 116.

75 Ermoldus Nigellus, *In Honorem Hludowici*, lines 892-925.

76 For the David and Solomon motif, see Wolfram, *Conrad II*, p. 150-53.

3 Anointment of the King as a political revolution

There was one point in the ritual described by Widukind that has to be highlighted here, as it had a great role in the later historiography. He stated *expressis verbis* that Otto had been anointed. The coronation was followed by a great feast where the *duces* of the kingdom served the king and the bishops at the table. This royal show was repeated many times by later kings. Service was a metaphor of the relationship between the king and his *duces*. Additionally, playing the roles of servants at the table symbolised other obligations of the *duces* toward their ruler.⁷⁷ For Lüdtkke, it was a turning point, because from then on the king stopped being *primus inter pares*. He became greater than the *duces*. Otto was a ruler and they were his servants; there was no more camaraderie between the king and his nobles.⁷⁸ This change was addressed also by Althoff, who expressed similar sentiments.⁷⁹ These symbols of change were not limited to a feast but were also connected with the anointment. For Lüdtkke, the realm stopped being German and the king no longer was a leader of the people. He became God's chosen and a sacral ruler. This was the beginning of a complete alteration of Germany. He saw in it the beginning of the Holy Roman Empire, which for him was a great tragedy for the German people. Since Otto was anointed, he had to go to Italy. An anointed king, a Church king had another step laid out: he had to be made an emperor. It leads to long and painful campaigns in the peninsula and fights with the papacy for the command over universal Europe.⁸⁰ Lüdtkke was not alone in such thoughts. Others also wrote how Otto changed the German nature of the Saxon kingdom into a more international, or rather universal concept.⁸¹

On the other hand, for Holtzmann the King was concerned with German interests and it was a reason for such a coronation.⁸² There were other historians who wrote during the Third Reich who did not deem everything that Otto done to be a bad thing. Günter, who finished writing his book in August of 1941, was one of them. For him, the anointment was not a treachery

77 Cf. among many: Bak, 'Medieval Symbolology', p. 60-61; attendance at such a feast was mandatory for a king, Barrow, 'Demonstrative', p. 142-43.

78 Lüdtkke, *König*, p. 199-200.

79 Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 74-75.

80 Lüdtkke, *König*, p. 201-03, 204-05. For the DDR scholars Otto's intervention in Italy was a sign of his greed for power and gold. He should instead have stayed north of the Alps and strengthened the kingdom there; Dorpalen, *German History*, p. 78-79.

81 On this, see Helzel, *Ein König*, p. 35-36.

82 Holtzmann, *Kaiser*, p. 28-29.

of his father's policy towards the Church, but a direct continuation. After his coronation Henry never expressed any sentiments against the Church; on the contrary, he was rather pious. Moreover, while writing about Aachen, Günter pointed out that the anointment was a relatively new element in the process of creating the king. Therefore, Otto's actions were just another step in the same direction already pointed by his father. Günter's book was published in the first months of the war against the USSR,⁸³ and while this was rather a coincidence, the overall tone of the book fits with contemporary German propaganda, where the war was presented as another Crusade.⁸⁴

There were others who saw Otto's anointment as a change which had no effect on his rule. According to them, he remained faithful to his father's policy towards the Church and the state, as his rule came from the *Volk*, and not the episcopate.⁸⁵ Nevertheless, Lüdtke connected Otto's policies with the civil wars and rebellions of disgruntled nobles, who wanted the older style of rule.⁸⁶ Althoff made a similar argument; he saw the coronation as a prediction of future disruptions inside the kingdom. He pointed to the anointment and the Frankish clothes. It was meant to be part of the larger strategy of rebuilding royal authority more in the Carolingian style. The final element of this was the feast which signified the difference of status between King and the *duces*.⁸⁷

It has to be brought up here that a feast as an element of a coronation ritual is well attested in texts from other kingdoms. In the *Life of St. Oswald* after Edgar was crowned, anointed, and received his regalia, there was a feast attended not only by the ruler, but also by the bishops and great nobles.⁸⁸ According to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, after Edgar's coronation at Bath, six kings were subjected to his rule.⁸⁹ This information is absent from the *Life of Saint Oswald*. Writing in the eleventh century, John of Worcester gave a more complex account: after having been accepted by eight rather than six kings, Edgar embarked on a ship. It was not a normal journey as Edgar was to steer it and the kings were sent to the oars.⁹⁰ This tale has an easy

83 Günter, *Kaiser*, p. 36-37. Günter had previously written positively about Christianity and its influence on the Empire; Günter, *Das Deutsche Mittelalter*, I, p. 42-43; cf. Schneider, *Die neueren Anschauungen*, p. 122-23.

84 Koenen, *Der Russland-Komplex*, p. 12; cf. Wolnik, *Mittelalter*, p. 119-22.

85 Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 28-29.

86 He called Otto's policies: 'romische "Divide et impera"', Lüdtke, *König*, p. 204.

87 Althoff, *Family*, p. 124; Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 77; Althoff, *Amicitia und pacta*, p. 91-92.

88 Byrhtferth of Ramsey, *Vita S. Oswaldi* IV.7.

89 *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* C(A, B) 972-73.

90 John of Worcester, *Florentii Wigorniensis*, ad 973; on this, see Thornton, 'Edgar', especially p. 74-79 for discussion of the meaning of the tale, including the possibility that in the original

explanation, as the ship represents the kingdom. The narrative is similar to the description of the Aachen coronation; in both cases the mighty of the kingdom are to serve the king. In this way it is asserted that the ruler is of a higher stance than the nobles and his supremacy over them is proven.⁹¹ Also Ermoldus, without any details, wrote about the banquet which followed the coronation of Louis the Pious by Charlemagne.⁹²

According to Althoff, the feast was an end of the system of *amicitia* pacts as a system of rule. No more was there friendship between the King and the higher nobility.⁹³ After Otto's rule, there was to be a clear division that led to a more centralised system of rule. The emergence of a hierarchical order in the society was a change from the previous situation of equality between the *duces*. This was connected to the view that Otto attacked people close to his father, to even more visibly show the change in the way the kingdom worked.⁹⁴

These discussions do not take into a consideration that in the narratives Henry was a *rex renitens* and had to act accordingly (refusal of the crown or the anointment). It was not a political statement on how he would rule, but an act of proper behaviour for a king from a new dynasty. Otto was the son of a ruler, therefore the way he was crowned does not say anything about any possible changes to the system of rule compared to his father's. He was not a *rex renitens*. In Widukind and Liudprand's chronicles there is no difference in the methods of executing power between Conrad, Henry, and Otto. The first Saxon king acts in the same way as his predecessor did, but contrary to him, he is successful. Also, Otto acts just like his father did in the pages of *Res Gestae*.

What is even more important and is forgotten in the context of the feast is that drinking wine had a special meaning. This act was aimed at creating a social group, where those who drank were bound together.⁹⁵ Otto, while being served, also made ties with his people and established his obligations toward them. As Köpke and Dümmler wrote, since Roman times servitude

form it was not about subjugation, but more about an alliance. Reuter pointed at the similarity of Edgar's boat and Otto's feast; Reuter, *Germany*, p. 148-49. Barrow has proposed that Edgar's scene was influenced by the way Henry and Charles the Simple met on the Island on Rhein; Barrow, 'Chester's', p. 86-87; she has also noted that water marked a neutral zone; Barrow, 'Demonstrative', p. 141.

91 Cf. Zotz, 'Kingship and Palaces', p. 313-14.

92 Ermoldus Nigellus, *In Honorem Hludowici*, line 726-27.

93 Althoff, *Amicitia und pacta*, p. 91-92, 93, 95.

94 Althoff, *Family*, p. 124-25.

95 Althoff, *Family*, p. 152-53; Althoff, 'Der frieden-', p. 15; Banaszkiewicz, 'Trzy razy uczta', p. 95-98; Pauk, 'Moneta', p. 470-81.

at the table was to be seen as a great honour. In their view this also applied to the Carolingian period. They proposed that for the *duces*, serving Otto after the coronation was not any form of humiliation, but was instead an elevation. At least from the old Germanic period the ruler chose only the best to serve him.⁹⁶ There was a clear community during the meal and eating alone was controversial. Thietmar noted that Otto III tried to resurrect the old Roman customs. One of them, according to the chronicler, was to eat alone at the table, which was contentious issue.⁹⁷

There is a clear distinction in the presented political situation of both Saxon kings in their narratives, which had obvious implications for the inclusion of the feast in the description. Henry had yet to subjugate the kingdom during his coronation. Only Eberhard would be then at the table. Therefore, there is no reason to see the feast as a dramatic change, more as a direct consequence of the Henry's rise, especially as similar feasts appear during the English coronations in the tenth century.⁹⁸

Historians, who see a great change in rule, would immediately point at the system of *amicitia* that was supposedly abolished by Otto, as evidence of such change.⁹⁹ It was mentioned here in a passing reference, but it has to be added that this is a controversial concept. There is a strong doubt over whether it is something that really existed or if it is only scholarly construction. Many of the arguments against the existence of *amicitia* seem reliable and there is enough doubt to not accept it as a fact. Lately, discussing the treaty of Bonn between Henry and Charles the Simple, a group of scholars have noted that *amicitia* used there was in fact a substitution for brotherhood. This was a treaty between two men, who were not relatives and therefore a new term had to be used.¹⁰⁰ Additionally *amicitia* has no strong presence

96 Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 38-39.

97 Thietmar, *Chronik* IV.47 (29).

98 Nelson, 'Ritual and Reality', p. 330-32; Hauck underlined that the making of a new king was also the remembrance of the dead which was generally done through feasting and there are many examples of ritual – making a community – feasts in the early Middle Ages; Hauck, 'Rituelle Speisegemeinschaft'.

99 Not every scholar praised Henry and accused Otto of betraying the Germanic style of rule. There were some who criticized Henry. For example, Walther Schultze wrote that Henry made far too many concessions to the *duces*. His system of rule led to an extreme weakening of central power and the kingdom could actually be called a confederation (*Staatenbund*). This corresponds with the myth of *Sonderweg*, that is a special way of Germany's movement towards the modern state. The general argument was that the decentralization of the kingdom was wrong, therefore Schultze's description should be seen as a very strong attack on Henry; Schultze, 'Die sächsischen', p. 262-63; Helzel, *Ein König*, p. 71; on Sonderweg see Reuter, 'The Medieval'; Warner, 'Reading', p. 89-101.

100 Kaeding, Seidel, and Kümmerlen, 'Heinrich I.', p. 279-80.

in narrative sources apart from *Res Gestae*.¹⁰¹ It is not that scholars do not find examples of various pacts in Liudprand or Adalbert's works but they are more complex. For example, in *Antapodosis*, the reconciliation of Henry and Arnulf was a matter of the pacification of a kingdom, where *amicitia* is in reality an act of subjugation of the *dux*.¹⁰² This *amicitia* had more to do with a proposal Arnulf could not refuse, than with the political system based on supposed ties of friendship.

Similarly, in *Res Gestae* friendship appears as a way of forcing acceptance. It is a friendship between a strong Saxon and those weaker than him. In this way the supposed change between Henry and Otto is more in the eye of modern historians than of medieval authors. This suggests the need for a reconsideration of the concept of *amicitia* and its veracity.¹⁰³

Getting back to the historiography, when in the third edition of his book Thoss wrote about Otto's ritual of coronation, he remarked that it had many old Germanic elements, such as election and acclamation and also the regalia which it used.¹⁰⁴ Otto, contrary to his father, had many Church figures around him and performed many deeds on behalf of the Church throughout his reign. These policies were later disastrous for Germany.¹⁰⁵ This does not mean that for Thoss Otto rejected his father's policy. On the contrary, his Empire was to continue Germanic politics. His rule retained a lot of his father's legacy; and while it was modelled on Charlemagne, it was a different, definitely German Empire. It was in fact a great achievement of his, as the whole of Europe: Burgundy, Italy, Poland, Bohemia, Hungary France, Greece, Denmark, and even England were under the influence of Germany. But according to Thoss this great project failed, it was too much for Germany to sustain and also the inner enemies, who destroyed the great power, were at work. All this is a clear reference to World War II, as Thoss acknowledged by making a reference to Hitler in his closing pages, as the one who, like Otto, defends Europe against the Eastern Hordes.¹⁰⁶

101 Cf. Althoff, *Amicitia und pacta*, p. 21-36.

102 Grabowski, „Duel“.

103 Cf. Kaeding, Seidel, and Kümmerlen, 'Heinrich I.', p. 282-92; Bachrach, *Warfare*, p. 20 note 40.

104 This part of the text was written specifically for the third edition. In the first and second editions Thoss was much more critical of Otto; Thoss, *Heinrich* (1936), p. 177-79.

105 Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 218-19.

106 Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 221-24. There are other instances where Otto was presented in a positive light, even when seen as a Christian ruler. For example, in the radio program aimed at schoolchildren presenting the Great of the Reich in the High Middle Ages (*die Großen des Reiches im Hochmittelalter*) he was described as a lord of the Church, against whom Rome would

Holtzmann had a clear idea about the beginning of Otto's rule in his biography. After the first few years of his reign, Henry strengthened his grip over the *duces* with the help of the Church.¹⁰⁷ When Otto was designated and inherited the kingdom, he wanted to use his coronation as a political sign. His choosing Aachen as the site for his coronation was a message to the Western Franks that Otto was an inheritor of Charlemagne's tradition and also to show his rights to Lotharingia. Writing about the anointment, Holtzmann used a euphemism. Instead of German 'unction' ('Salbung') he used 'church action' ('die kirchliche Handlung'). Still, he did not hide the meaning of the act, instead he wrote that the anointment meant that Otto wanted to be closer to the Church. It was not a revolution, but a continuation of change that had already begun during the later years of Henry's rule. Even the feast and service of the *duces*, while new, was downplayed by the short information that it later took place on special occasions. For Holtzmann, at the time of Otto's coronation everything looked like the beginning of his rule would be peaceful, but in the end it was different.¹⁰⁸

Holtzmann wrote similar things in his later book. Here Henry at first was staying away from the Church, but after he subjugated and made peace with the *duces*, he was able to strengthen the kingdom and to do so, he based his power on the Church, as a natural ally against the *duces*. Henry began to construct the Royal Chapel and Chancellery. In 923 he chose Archbishop Heriger of Mainz as an arch-chaplain.¹⁰⁹ After Burchard's death, Henry was to take control over Swabia by giving it in 926 to Hermann, a member of Conrad's family, who married Regeline, a widow of Burchard. This broke the autonomy of the duchy and led it into the king's control. Similarly, Henry subjected the Church in Lotharingia to himself.¹¹⁰

Otto was introduced by Holtzmann as a lover of hunting, war, and German songs. He chose Aachen not without a reason, as Charlemagne was to be his model. It was not only needed for the Liudolfings to strengthen the control over Lotharingia, but it also showed their supremacy over the West Frankish kingdom. Otto, not Louis d'Outremer, was a real successor to Charlemagne.¹¹¹

not dare to rise. This was because of his power and will, which his successors lacked; Wolnik, *Mittelalter*, p. 348-49.

¹⁰⁷ Holtzmann, *Kaiser*, p. 18-19.

¹⁰⁸ Holtzmann, *Kaiser*, p. 26-28.

¹⁰⁹ For Holtzmann it was possible that a rival for this post was Archbishop of Salzburg, but as this see was in control of Arnulf, Henry had to reject such an idea; Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 79.

¹¹⁰ Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 80-82.

¹¹¹ Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 110, 112.

Looking closer at what happened in Aachen, Holtzmann wrote that the double elevation to kingship and the number of attendants was to show that the whole Reich supported Otto. Thus, it is not in any way surprising that for him the anointment was not against Henry's politics, as later he was close to the Church. It seems that he wanted his readers to be convinced that it was good thing; he also wrote that Louis d'Outremer was anointed, to show that Otto also had to accept it. For him Otto's coronation preserved and followed Henry's politics. It was not a revolution, but a continuation.¹¹²

Günter first noted that Henry returned the sense of power and strength of Charlemagne's age to the kingdom. The first Saxon ruler evolved from being a *dux* to a defender of the Church, a true king. Otto continued Henry's policy, which is seen in the presence of bishops around him. The reason for choosing Aachen for his coronation was to show that Otto was an inheritor of Charlemagne. The anointment made Otto a Christian ruler and it was quite common all over Europe. It was an evolution, not revolution. This was hardly responsible for later problems of the kingdom.¹¹³

For Althoff, in Widukind's description of Otto's coronation, the similarities between it and the 961 coronation of his son were important. He came to a conclusion, that while Widukind was inspired by the way Otto II's coronation looked like, he has no doubts that it was a basis for a description, because the chronicler knew that Otto's coronation was similar. This is probable, according to Althoff, especially as there is no reason that Otto would order changing a ritual of coronation for his son. Therefore, Althoff's description follows Widukind.¹¹⁴

The anointment not only legitimised his rule, but also gave it an aura of God's grace and added special demands for a king, which were explained by Archbishop Hildebert. For Althoff, Widukind tried to downplay the role of the Church in the act of transferring the rule and crown. The anointment was responsible for the substitution of the charisma of blood by the charisma of God's elect. The final element of the whole ritual was the feast. During it, the *duces'* service at the table showed that they were to serve the new king also in other matters. This was to be a new ritual. This and other elements of the process marked that Otto was to return to Carolingian tradition. Aachen as a place for the coronation also strengthened the inclusion of Lotharingia into kingdom. At the same time, the tomb of Charlemagne there signified

112 Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 113, 115.

113 Günter, *Kaiser*, p. 34-38.

114 Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 69-72.

the continuity of rule. Still, the crown did not come to Otto in 936 without some problems, but their extent is difficult to attest.¹¹⁵

When Althoff again wrote about these matters, he presented the past in a way similar to Holtzmann. Since 925 Henry was using religion to legitimize his rule.¹¹⁶ He reigned in contact with the *duces* and calling his position *primus inter pares* has some merit, but the relationship was much more complicated. Nevertheless, the role of the *duces* in his reign was strong. For Otto's coronation in Aachen, he followed Widukind's description. Some elements of the description from *Res Gestae*, such as the place of coronation, are truthful. Aachen was chosen here to strengthen the connection of Lotharingia to the Reich. Still, Althoff had some doubts about it, hypothesising that some things, like the anointment, could be taken from Otto II's coronation, while others could be drawn from the previous designation of Otto I by Henry a few years before. Althoff noted that the coronation was in many ways a revolution, as Otto returned to many Frankish traditions and used the formula *Dei gratia (rex)* from that point. He also highlighted the individual succession.¹¹⁷

According to Laudage, the coronation and anointment were only a confirmation of the status of the king acquired by Otto from the hands of the *duces* and other present there before entering the Church. Otto's rule was based on the decision of Henry and its acceptance by those loyal to him. The description of the coronation was close to Mainz *Ordo*, but it was probably inspired by the 961 coronation of Otto II. Laudage tried to recover the facts from Widukind's narration and came to the conclusion that the core of the text is correct. Otto's rite followed the common pattern of coronations.¹¹⁸

Otto's coronation in the sources was, as shown, not the recreations of later times. The narratives express ideological ideas, with on the one hand, in Widukind's version, a connection to the Carolingian past and insistence on the political rituals. They are described in detail and served for the later historiographical discussions, which treated them selectively, not being concerned with the overall outlook of the chronicle. Liudprand's more ideological and symbolic narrative, expressing the idea that Otto was a great ruler connected to the hero of ancient Rome, was left out. In effect, the important point in the construction of *Antapodosis* was omitted. Liudprand set the stage for Otto's future glory.

115 Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 73-75.

116 Althoff and Keller, *Die Zeit*, p. 122-23.

117 Althoff and Keller, *Die Zeit*, p. 147, 149-54, 156.

118 Laudage, *Otto*, p. 97-102, 104.

Part II

King and his Kingdom

‘It was Henry I, in my opinion, the star of the purest light in the vast firmament of our past’¹

‘Long Live Emperor Henry!
Saxony’s star’²

Now I will discuss the way in which Liudprand depicted the civil wars. Liudprand created an elaborate construction: a comparison between the good German kings, who avoid bloodshed, and others, who pursue it.

Even though there is a difference in how the fights look like – Henry fought no single battle against Christians, while Otto had to wage war – it is not the motif, but the execution that matters. Liudprand used the first rebellion against Otto to show him as a king who never fights. This is followed with the concept that Otto is a God’s chosen ruler. He almost constantly either prays for victory, or thanks God for it. The war is thus depicted as a struggle between the rebels and Otto’s faith. This element sets *Antapodosis* apart from other sources about the Ottonian period. Liudprand’s story addresses different elements of the perception of the past than Widukind’s, which was more closely connected to the description of campaigns and politics. I will show how these differences play out and how they are accountable by the difference in the concept of each chronicle.

1 ‘Es war Heinrich I., nach meiner Meinung der Stern des reinsten Lichtes an dem weiten Firmament unserer Vergangenheit’, Sybel, ‘Über’, p. 12.

2 ‘Hoch lebe Kaiser Heinrich, hoch! / Des Sachsenlandes Stern!’, Vogl, ‘Heinrich Der Vogler’.

3 How Henry I Subjugated the Kingdom without Bloodshed¹

The ideal king in the Middle Ages is quite obviously only a truly Christian one. This is more than the popular concept of *rex pacificus* – a peaceful king. What I want to show here is that in Liudprand's tale Henry is a pious king, one chosen by higher authority and at the same time one who behaved in the ideal fashion towards his subjects.

The concept and construction of *rex pacificus* emerged in the period of the later Carolingians, but was rooted in Charlemagne's reign. *Pacificus* became part of his title in documents.² He was depicted as the ultimate peaceful king and guarantor of peace. This was not limited to the adjectives used to describe Charlemagne, but was also part of the argument for the whole dynasty's right to rule. The abolishment of the last Merovingian King Childeric III happened because he only acted like a peacemaker, while the Carolingian Mayor of the Palace Charles Martel (and implicitly his descendants) were peacemakers in fact.³

In this construction there is a strict demand for a king to protect his subjects. Such an understanding of his role can be seen in the oldest surviving English coronation *ordo*, where it is said that the peace and safety of a kingdom were guaranteed by the Maker. By his grace and power the land was defended. The king was in a way God's vessel and consequently he protected his subjects.⁴

The idea of *rex pacificus* brings back the already mentioned description of the attendance at Conrad's deathbed scene in *Antapodosis* and the difference with Widukind's version. Scholars have not taken enough notice of who was present in these accounts. In *Antapodosis* Eberhard of Franconia, Burchard of Swabia, and Giselbert of Lotharingia are present. Widukind mentions only Eberhard, while other sources mention no names at all. Before explaining the difference, the context of this story in *Res Gestae* must be fleshed out.

1 The subject was previously discussed by me in the article Grabowski, '„Duel“'. Some of the arguments proposed there are re-used here.

2 Kershaw, *Peaceful*, p. 167.

3 Kershaw, *Peaceful*, p. 134-36, 138-39, 142.

4 Kershaw, *Peaceful*, p. 249.

In his following chapters, Widukind describes a series of military interventions. While the depiction is not bloody, or at least this aspect of war is not mentioned, the descriptions are still concerned with power and forced subjugation. Henry and his army first moved on Swabia, then on to Bavaria, and finally entered Lotharingia.⁵ Widukind wanted Henry to stand out in comparison with Conrad. The Franconian king not only unsuccessfully attempted to subjugate the Saxon *dux*, but also never attempted to regain Lotharingia, which in the chronicle's narrative changed allegiance to the Western Frankish kingdom after the death of Arnulf of Carinthia.⁶ Conrad's final war was the unsuccessful campaign in Bavaria, for which failure he paid with his life. This comparison is favourable towards the Saxon king who is able to dominate the *duces* and to subjugate the duchy. It is quite clear that for Widukind he was not a *rex pacificus*, since he fought civil wars to achieve his domination.

Liudprand painted a different picture. In Conrad's second year of rule, there was a general rebellion of the *duces*. The text is written in a way that makes it appear that Eberhard was also one of the rebels,⁷ while it is obvious that he was not.⁸ The whole kingdom was in disarray, but Conrad successfully brought about peace. Everyone returned to their allegiance and only Arnulf ran away to the Hungarians. This is followed by the deathbed scene, during which, apart from Conrad and Eberhard, Burchard and Giselbert are present. Historians easily pointed out that it was false and had no basis in reality, as Burchard was yet to accept Henry as king and Lotharingia was outside of Conrad's influence. The duchy was under the control of the Western Frankish kingdom and Giselbert himself got the title *dux* from Charles the Simple. It became part of the East Frankish kingdom only after 925.⁹

By writing the scene in such way, Liudprand made Henry a peaceful king. These are similar ideas to Notker the Stammerer's notion, that Louis the German never spilled Christian blood. To quote: 'He earned his reputation for he never [...] stained his hand by shedding Christian blood, except when absolutely necessary'.¹⁰ In another of Notker's tales, Charlemagne had conquered the Lombards with a 'bloodless battle'.¹¹ In *Antapodosis*, Henry

5 Widukind I.27, 30.

6 Widukind I.29.

7 *Antapodosis* II.19.

8 Karpf, *Herrscherlegitimation*, p. 14, note 64.

9 Hlawitschka, *Lotharingien*, p. 203, 205.

10 'Et merito [...] aut manus suas effusione sanguinis christiani commacularet praeter ultimam necessitatem', Notkerus Balbulus, *Gesta Karoli*, II.11; Noble, p. 102.

11 'Incruento bello', Notkerus Balbulus, *Gesta Karoli*, II.17; Noble, p. 111.

is able to acquire power over the kingdom without using the sword and he never needs to attack Lotharingia, because its *dux* was already present in the designation scene. By accepting Conrad's decision, Giselbert submits to Henry's sovereignty. Thus, there is no need to describe any military action.

While Liudprand had a general idea for the whole work, there are some places where he contradicts himself. Later on, he wrote that Henry fought many wars (always in defence and with God's grace), about which there is no information in *Antapodosis*.¹² This corresponds with warlike description in *Vita Mathildis reginae antiquior*, where Henry is described as a king who conquered people outside of his influence: Slavs, Danes, Bohemians, and Bavarians.¹³

Widukind gives a completely different ideological view of Henry's rule. He spends a considerable amount of time explaining the King's wars which marked his rule as different from Conrad. The Saxon is powerful and strong, which his predecessor failed to be. Henry was able to defeat his enemies and not only forced the *duces* of Swabia and Bavaria into allegiance, but he also retook Lotharingia. Therefore, there is no place for these *duces* to be present at the deathbed scene. Widukind legitimised Henry as a ruler who rebuilt his kingdom. This was one of the typical actions of a new king.¹⁴

In *Antapodosis* Conrad asks the gathered nobles to 'pursue peace and concord' and instructs that no 'lust for ruling and no ambition to command inflame' them.¹⁵ Hincmar wrote about the relation between a good king and the happiness of the people and conversely the lack of fortune with a bad king.¹⁶ Rulers were responsible for the fate of their kingdom, therefore rebellions and famines are directly connected with their failure to rule properly. This was a popular concept during the whole Carolingian age.¹⁷ In the Irish tradition there is an idea that a good king is responsible for everything positive in the kingdom. This is known as *fir flathemon*, which is translated as *justice*, or *truth of the ruler*. On the other hand, falsehood of the ruler (*gáu flathemon*) causes everything to be bad.¹⁸

The importance of peace is also seen in *Antapodosis*. Liudprand describes various civil wars, discords, infidelities towards rulers, and also the lack

¹² *Antapodosis* IV.25.

¹³ *VMra*, c. 3.

¹⁴ Weiler, 'Crown-giving', p. 80.

¹⁵ 'Pacem vos concordiamque sectari [...] nulla vos regnandi cupiditas, nulla praesidendi ambitio inflammet', *Antapodosis* II.20; Squatriti, p.84.

¹⁶ Hincmar of Reims, *De regis persona*, c. 2.

¹⁷ Blattmann, 'Ein Unglück', particularly, p. 91-97; cf. Gąssowska, 'Rozwój kultu', p. 4-5.

¹⁸ Aitchison, 'Regicide', p.117-18; according to the Anglo-Saxon *Promissio regis* a bad king brings sadness to the kingdom; Clayton, 'The Old English', p. 148.

of proper behaviour in marriage. His focus was on the Italian examples, depicting it as a land of constant warring between kings and their subjects. These rebellions marked the fall of the kingdom and the discord led to pagan raids and oppression from Fraxinetum, Africa, and Hungary.¹⁹ A consequence of these conflicts between the Christians, was the setting up of the Muslim colony in Fraxinetum.²⁰ In such a context the invocation for peace in the descriptions of the designation is unique. Liudprand's good king is marked by a peaceful reign.

The conflict between Henry and Arnulf differs from the Italian examples. The clash begins after the coronation, when Arnulf returns from Hungary. He is moved by his people to take up the claim of kingship. In response, Henry enters Bavaria with his army and there he meets Arnulf, but instead of a battle between the two, the Saxon king invites his enemy to have a personal discussion. This is understood by the *Dux* as a challenge to a duel, but he is soon corrected. When both leaders meet, Henry makes a speech directed at him and through it makes peace and subjugates Arnulf. There is no war and no blood. Henry could have entered into battle against Arnulf, but he refused; he could have fought a duel but that would still have been too much, so he achieved peace through words.

The importance of this description could be missed by someone who never read the whole of *Antapodosis*. Liudprand constantly refers to civil wars and conflicts over kingship, such as the bloody fights between Berengar I and Louis of Provence that ended in the blinding of the latter.²¹ There are few successful peaceful changes of rule in *Antapodosis*.²² Also, Henry forgave and acted mercifully, while those forgiven remained bound by the promise given to him.²³

But there is more in the speech made by Henry, in which he asks Arnulf: 'Do you really [...] [d]esire to waste Christians' lives?'²⁴ This sentence led to the idea that a good king has to preserve peace and therefore Henry is a good king. He did what he could to defend his subjects while it is his enemies who want to kill Christians. The higher dictate to defend Christianity is combined with God's grace that is put on Henry. In the same speech he asks, 'Why do you resist God's order with unsound mind?', followed with,

19 *Antapodosis* I.4, II.42, 51.

20 *Antapodosis* I.2-4.

21 *Antapodosis* II.41.

22 Except for Germany: Louis the Child: *Antapodosis* II.1, Conrad I: *Antapodosis* II.17, Henry I: *Antapodosis* II.20, and to some extent Otto I: *Antapodosis* IV. 15-16.

23 *Antapodosis* II.22.

24 'Tune [...] Corpora christicolum perdere valde sitis?', *Antapodosis* II.22; Squatriti, p. 86.

By Christ's command, which sustains the mechanism of the world.
 Even Tartarus fears him, Flegeton respects him;
 He pulverizes splendid kings, willing them to be terrified for a while
 And exalted for a while; he raises up the poor, if he wants,
 For which may they give the proper praises to God for centuries.²⁵

Henry is clearly chosen by God. While there was a designation process, his true power comes from God and God's will. This places the legitimisation and the understanding of his rule on a different level.

God is omnipotent and it is his ruling that gives power to Henry. These lines were added to the poem not to inform readers about God or theology. It was intended to set the moment and create an understanding for the remainder of the work. God is not an advocate of other rulers, and does not appear as a provider of power to the mighty. On the contrary, he punishes the wicked and chooses those who have the right to rule. He is not the one who takes the life of good men; it is Death who takes the life of good kings: Conrad and Lambert.²⁶ Throughout *Antapodosis* Liudprand expresses a belief in God's plan, in which the Lord moves the figures on a board and decides on who he will award and who punish.

As a part of a resolution of the conflict, Henry also gave control over the Bavarian bishoprics to Arnulf. While this could be interpreted as something negative, in the context of the narrative it expresses a demand for religious reforms. This type of action fits a certain pattern of behaviour. For example, one of the reasons for the support of Wamba by the Visigothic bishops was that he presented himself as someone who would restore Church's discipline.²⁷ A new monarch's objective is to commit himself to the religious reforms. While giving control over bishoprics hardly looks like a positive thing to do in the context of the narrative, it was still an act of religious activity.

The style and attitude of the speech to Arnulf in *Antapodosis* refers to poetry of the Roman age. Colonna came to a conclusion that this one speech was meant to represent Henry as a great speaker, but it is more plausible that the speech was included as a reference to Liudprand's vast literary

25 'Insana Domini iussis quid mente resistis? [...] Imperio Chrisit, quo constat machina mundi.
 / Tartarus hunc metuit, hunc Flegeton timuit; / Conterit hic nitidos reges dudumque tremendos
 / Sublimesque volens; erigit hic miseros, / Quo debitas Domino laudes, per secula solvant',
Antapodosis II.22; Squatriti, p. 86.

26 *Antapodosis* I.44, II.20.

27 Isidore of Seville, *Concilium Toletanum XI*, c. 16; Nelson, 'National Synods', p. 244-45.

knowledge and poetic abilities. The use of elegiac distich and references to Virgil and others make this the more believable explanation.²⁸

Henry's ascent in *Antapodosis* differs from what can be found in other sources. In *Antapodosis* there is the creation of a *rex christianus*, which Henry is in more than one way. He is a good Christian who defends the Church and its people. He is also a chosen king. This is also strengthened by the answer Arnulf received from his advisers about what he should do. By acknowledging the position and power of Henry's words, they elevated him to a higher position in the kingdom.²⁹ What's more, they stated that people should stand not only for good but even for bad kings, as these rulers' behaviour is connected to their subjects' behaviour. If they act wrongly, then the kings will be bad.

The importance of peace is not only limited to Henry's character. In the poem about Otto's rise, there is an important quote: 'King Otto, who will pursue the nations / With great authority and bring blessed peace'.³⁰ The importance of peace is later repeated in *Relatio de legatione*, where Otto is depicted as the messenger of peace.³¹ His aggressive actions are part of his mission to protect the people. If there is a conflict, it is only made on grounds of a pursuit of peace.

In Liudprand's later poem about Otto there is a reference to the king acting in a good way towards the 'holy' ('sanctis') which is compared with his aggressive stance against the 'savage' ('saevis') indicating more devilish elements.³² This is also present in the poem written against Henry, who was to be moved by the devil; before that Arnulf was addressed in similar terms in Henry I's speech.³³ The text implies an indirect but quite obvious elevation and sanctification of the Liudolfing dynasty.

Frutolf compressed Liudprand and Widukind's narratives about the fights that Henry had to undertake to become undisputed king. He took Widukind's vision as a basis and repeated the information about Henry leading the Saxon army into Swabia. Frutolf took a different approach when he described Arnulf's affair. He copied the story from *Antapodosis*, but shortened Liudprand's poem to a few sentences and in the process lost its

28 Colonna, *Le poesie*, p. 85-87; Liudprand of Cremona, *The Complete*, p. 86 note 26, Liudprandus Cremonensis, *Opera Omnia*, p. 44-45.

29 Colonna, *Le poesie*, p. 88.

30 'Otto rex, gentes dicione magna / Qui premet pacemque feret beatam', *Antapodosis* IV.16; Squatriti, p. 152.

31 *Relatio de legatione*, c. 57; Colonna, *Le poesie*, p. 166-67.

32 *Antapodosis* IV.16; Squatriti, p. 152.

33 Colonna, *Le poesie*, p. 167.

poetic nature.³⁴ After this interlude, Frutolf returned to Widukind's story and wrote about how Henry conquered Lotharingia.

Waitz wrote that as Burchard was fighting against Rudolph II of Burgundy, he was not in a position to stand against Henry. While the *Dux* did not participate in the election, he welcomed the King into his lands. Burchard was also given control over the Church in his duchy.³⁵ Arnulf, on the other hand, expresses claims to the crown as Waitz followed Liudprand's description and discussed how Bavaria was a kingdom at some point in the past.³⁶ The end of the conflict is presented as a series of images. Waitz first presents Liudprand's version of the resolution of the conflict and then Widukind's version. All the details from the sources are included, while their veracity is little discussed. While he noted that Arnulf got control of the Church from Henry, Waitz added that it was only in later generations that the Bavarian *dux* was criticised for his actions over it.³⁷ He also wrote repeatedly about Lotharingia and how it was returned to Germany. While Henry subjugated the duchies, for Waitz he truly reigned only in Saxony. This did not mean that the kingdom fell apart. This was only a beginning for the Reich; the truly united kingdom would emerge later on.³⁸

Cartellieri was much more interested in the recovery of Lotharingia than in the conflicts between Henry and his *duces*. Not only did he write about Conrad's failed actions, but also that after Henry's coronation, Burchard and Arnulf distanced themselves from the Saxon king.³⁹ Both were forced into an allegiance; Burchard was weakened by the fights with Rudolph of Burgundy and while Arnulf was also defeated, Henry gave him the control over bishoprics in exchange for his surrender. Still, it is clear that for Cartellieri the real victory and unification of Germany only occurred after Henry recovered Lotharingia.⁴⁰

Lüdtke's text has much more detailed reasons for the actions of Henry's enemies. He placed great emphasis on the fact that Burchard wanted his duchy to not be a part of a German kingdom. For him, Italian politics were becoming more important. But when Burchard was unable to withstand the incursion of the Saxons, he had to accept Henry. This was the first success

34 Frutolf, *Chronicon*, p. 180.

35 Waitz, *Jahrbücher* (1885) p. 42-45

36 Waitz, *Jahrbücher* (1885) p. 52-53

37 Waitz, *Jahrbücher* (1885) p. 55-56

38 Waitz, *Jahrbücher* (1885) p. 58

39 Cartellieri, *Die Weltstellung*, p. 4-5.

40 Cartellieri, *Die Weltstellung*, p. 13-15, 15-16.

of the new King, who was able to safeguard his kingdom against those who wanted to break away from it.⁴¹

Similarly, Bavaria is presented as being drawn into Italian concerns. Also Donau and the Slavic lands, supposed to be basis of Ostmark, the future Austria, are presented as being a focus of Bavarian expansion.⁴² The general strength and political interests of Bavaria encouraged its rulers to consider independence. The important element was the control over the Church in the duchy. Arnulf is aware that Henry took away from Burchard the power of appointing bishops. This is the main reason for his stand against Henry. Lüdtke wrote a long and very specific rebuttal of the account of *Annales Juvavenses maximi* about Arnulf's claimed title of king. He argued that it was written long afterwards and that the term *Teutonicorum* is not correct for the tenth century. He opposed the idea that Arnulf could claim the crown. The *Dux's* aims were limited to the borders of his duchy and his control over it and not concerned with expansion to north.⁴³

As for the confrontation between Arnulf and Henry, Lüdtke first wrote about Widukind's description of it. There is a description of the military campaign, but later on he notes that Liudprand had a different account. The difference is more about the words, than meaning. Then he writes about the *Antapodosis* version. He follows it quite slavishly and finishes with Henry leaving the Bavarian Church in Arnulf's hands. This is a small price for protecting the unity of the kingdom. Creation of the south eastern border of Germany is Henry's great achievement.⁴⁴

While Lüdtke vaguely wrote that control over the Church was behind the rebellions, Thoss was more specific. In his text, Henry and all Conrad's enemies are against the Church and Papacy. Papal Rome is a dangerous enemy of Germanness. Conrad is presented as a pawn in the hands of the bishops. In contrast, Henry is a bold German hero. When he notices that at Hohenaltheim council in 916 there will be envoys of the Papacy, he prohibits members of the Saxon Church to participate. If there is to be any Christianity, it needed to work for German interests. But what is most important, in Thoss' opinion, is that the failure of the Conrad's reign almost led to blocking the emergence of the German Reich. Through conflict and strong self-reliance Bavaria, Swabia, and Saxony could become independent.⁴⁵

41 Lüdtke, *König*, p. 85-87.

42 Lüdtke, *König*, p. 94; cf. Helzel, *Deutsche Bevölkerungsfantasien*, p. 39-42; Schmitz-Berning, *Vokabular*, p. 456-59.

43 Lüdtke, *König*, p. 95-97.

44 Lüdtke, *König*, p. 98.

45 Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 38-40.

Saxony was the only German land which was outside Christian and Frankish influence for so long. It created a situation where there was a strong Germanic understanding of the past and present and the concept of *Volk*, which was absent in Bavaria, or Swabia. This is why Arnulf, as Thoss saw *Annales Juvavenses Maximi* as trustworthy, was to become a king and was to be anointed by the Archbishop of Salzburg in 920.⁴⁶ He saw a clear political statement in Arnulf and Burchard's actions. They wanted to become kings. While the possible claims of former were discussed in many places, the claims of the latter is his own interpretation.⁴⁷

Henry had duchies that were falling away from the Reich. First, he enters Swabia where he reconciled with the *Dux*. He does so by giving him a free hand in Burgundy. Thanks to this, Henry is able to not only subjugate it without any form of resistance, but also gained control over the Church, against which Burchard took many actions. Nevertheless, Henry accepts the role of the *Dux* in the appointment of bishops there and agrees to Burchard's appointment of Udalric to Augsburg.⁴⁸

Next is Bavaria with Arnulf as an anti-king. Henry travels to Regensburg where Arnulf is based. While at first it seems that Thoss followed Widukind, as would be expected, he changed the source of his information. At the city walls Henry shows the clarity of his mind and thinking about the people. He invites Arnulf for a discussion. The two leaders meet in person and then Henry is able to overcome the Bavarian ruler's will and the duchy remains a part of the kingdom. Henry is a great 'Nordic hero' who by his action showed the 'German desire for peace', which is different from the 'foreign pacifism'.⁴⁹ While he was aware that, for example, Ranke saw Liudprand's story as false,⁵⁰ for him it had a nucleus of true happenings, or at least showed the 'true' Henry through an interesting tale.⁵¹ Thoss repeats not only the narrative, but also its meaning. By honouring Henry for the peaceful and bloodless resolution of the conflict, he followed the concept found in *Antapodosis*. Still, he underlined that all this was an old German Nordic tradition, where the duel was in line with his fixation on Germanness and Nordicism. He

46 Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 69.

47 Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 65.

48 Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 72.

49 'Nordische Held [...] deutschen Friedenswillen [...] artfremdem Pazifismus', Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 73.

50 Ranke, *Weltgeschichte*, p. 116-17.

51 Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 236 note 56; Himmler in his speech in Quedlinburg treated Liudprand's account as truthful, calling the speech, 'an offender deutscher Aussprache', Himmler, *Rede*, p. 8.

used this to compare Henry with *Res Gestae*'s Conrad. The way of successful peaceful resolution of the conflict was a proof of strength and the true dominance of the Liudolfings and Germanness over the Conradines and their Frankish ways.⁵²

For Thoss, the effect of the peaceful resolution was a special status of Bavaria that it retained up to the time when NSDAP took power. Henry left the Church and minting money in Arnulf's hands and to some extent let him continue his independent foreign policy. It was done so not because he wanted to create some sort of confederacy, but because he was aware that the duchies were far too different to force them into unification. It had to be done piecemeal.⁵³

There is here an example of how current events influenced and shaped the writing about the Ottonians. For the late nineteenth century writers the war against Lotharingia and the conflicts with the future French kingdom were sometimes more important than the glorious victories against the Slavs. It seems that for them France was Germany's main enemy. This comes from the experience of the French-Prussian war which led to the unification of Germany. This was then strengthened by the loss of Alsace-Lorraine in the Treaty of Versailles, which was seen as taking ancient German lands from the fatherland. In such a context the wars, not present in *Antapodosis*, became the centre of attention.⁵⁴ It is good to see what Lüdtke and Thoss wrote about Lotharingia in this context. When recently Carlrichard Brühl wrote about the relations and beginnings of Germany and France, he was concentrating on Lotharingia. It almost dominated his narrative, but at the same time he noted that in the high Middle Ages and later until the nineteenth century Lotharingia did not provoke conflict. There was rivalry and clashes between France and Germany, but there were different causes behind these conflicts.⁵⁵ He nevertheless wrote, downplaying the nationalistic tone, that Henry wanted to restore the East Frankish kingdom to the borders set by Arnulf of Carinthia.⁵⁶ The idea is the same as in the

52 Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 73-74.

53 Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 74.

54 Helzel, *Ein König*, p. 63; Lotharingia was an irreplaceable part of Germany for the scholars working under the Nazi regime. Christoph Obermüller noted that while there were five *Stämme* that made Germany (Saxons, Franks, Bavarians, Swabians and Thuringians), the last of these had no duchy. On the other hand, the five duchies that created Germany were Saxony, Franconia, Swabia, Bavaria and Lotharingia (Obermüller, *Die deutschen Stämme*, p. 290). Since the tenth century Lotharingia was always a part of Germany (p. 317-20). Henry's acquisition of the duchy in 925 was compared to the building of the eastern border of the kingdom in 929 (p. 299).

55 Brühl, *Deutschland--Frankreich*, p. 722.

56 Brühl, *Deutschland--Frankreich*, p. 441-42.

nineteenth century and later, but there was no Germany as a driving force behind Henry's actions. Lüttke and Thoss are different here not because of their being more concerned about Lotharingia, but because of the additional ideological elements they included. Brühl writes in a period when Germany and France are friends, so certain themes are given less prominence. For Lüttke, the loss of the duchy by Germany was a great misfortune and put the rest of the kingdom in danger. He implied that if Lotharingia remained separate from the kingdom, this could lead to the complete partition of Germany. He noted a strong allegiance of the duchy towards the local dynasty, Reginard and his son Giselbert. The situation changed after the latter succeeded his father and a conflict with Charles the Simple emerged. Forced out from the duchy, he searched for help at Henry's court. Then, after finishing things with Bavaria, Henry turned to Lotharingia. Lüttke described the whole operation as a plan for peaceful conquest. He noted how, step by step, Henry moved into the duchy and then received from Giselbert the crown symbolising the Lordship over Lotharingia. This was finalised by making peace and friendship between Henry and Charles, who was forced to acknowledge the rise of the Saxon king in the Bonn treaty.⁵⁷ There were later problems with Lotharingia until 925 when Lüttke states that the 'Rhine, Maas, and Mosel were saved for Germany'.⁵⁸

Thoss was of the opinion that soon after becoming the king, Henry began his move towards reclaiming Lotharingia, which Conrad was unable to do. The duchy became a part of the West Frankish kingdom after his election.⁵⁹ Nobles of Franconia and Eberhard himself were behind the initiative to recover this land. While actions were not direct because Henry did not want it so, the objective was achieved. Thoss compared the East and West Frankish kingdoms. In the East, the people were unified with Nordic blood, which in the Middle Ages gave Germany supremacy over Europe. In what was in the future to become France the situation was different, as the Germanic blood (obviously superior) fought with the Gallo-Celtic.

The change of power and the realignment of Lotharingia was connected to the weakness of West Frankish kingdom. Its inability to protect the duchy from the Hungarian raids led Giselbert to hand it over to Henry together with the crown. But the German king was smart and careful. He used this situation to acquire the recognition of his title from Charles. Here Thoss

57 Lüttke, *König*, p. 88-92.

58 'Rhein, Maas und Mosel waren für Deutschland gerettet', Lüttke, *König*, p. 94.

59 Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 75-76.

made an allusion to later times, noting that everyone knows that it was quite difficult for a member of a lower family to acquire recognition of their titles.⁶⁰

Therefore, during the meeting with Charles on the island on Rhine, Henry had a new role. He was now a leader of *regnum Teutonicorum*. It was the next step for previous Germanic endeavours, as while the 'German Reich was Frankish Reich', after the death of Conrad the new kingdom was based on Saxon ideals, which led to 'Germany's new beginning'.⁶¹ In his narrative of this recognition, Thoss compared Charles to Conrad. In his opinion both kings tried to use the Church against the nobles and both failed. Nevertheless, it took some time before Lotharingia became reunited with Germany. It happened in 925 and Thoss noted that in 1925 there were millennial celebrations in the Rhineland. In the third edition of his book Thoss added that in 1940 the German Reich had again taken over Lotharingia.⁶²

Lüdtke saw a great act in Henry's victory and his expansion of control over Swabia, Lotharingia, and Bavaria. It was a creation of the Reich based not on centralism, and absolutism, but on the unity of the kingdom and the *Stämme*. It was the end of the Carolingian state and the beginning of a new (German) concept of the kingdom, where the *Volk* had a great role.⁶³ Bringing back Lotharingia into the East Frankish kingdom was of the greatest importance. This is a reference to the political situation after World War I, when Lotharingia was lost by Germany to France and, as Lüdtke noted, in the tenth century it happened because of the weakness of the Eastern kingdom, not because the Western kingdom was strong. It is reminiscent of how Hitler and German nationalists saw how the First World War was lost because of Germany's internal enemies.

The highlighting of the Germanness of the *Volk* is quite obviously a statement about the ideology. Lüdtke emphasised the fact that this true Germany was not a centralised state. On the contrary, he described it as a unity of a free people. This fits the bizarre construction of the Third Reich.⁶⁴ Contrary to popular opinion, power was non-centralised with many people having broad autonomy as long as they followed Hitler's general ideas. It was some sort of planned chaos.⁶⁵ While Hitler, as a *Führer*, was in control

60 Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 77.

61 'Das Deutsche Reich war ein fränkisches Reich [...] Deutschlands Neuanfang', Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 77.

62 Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 78-79, 81-82.

63 Lüdtke, *König*, p. 98-99.

64 It was to be based on the Holy Roman Empire of Middle Ages; Mees, 'Hitler and Germanentum', p. 265-66.

65 See for example the opinions quoted in Beaumont, *The Nazis*, p. 19-20, 28-29.

of everything, at the same time the division of power, often overlapping, was quite extensive. Here the concept of Henry ruling over an independent people who make their own policies and at the same time remain loyal subjects to their king seems like it was based on the way Germany was ruled after 1933. Therefore, Henry, who united the kingdom, is a figure similar to Hitler in this propaganda. In the public perception, Hitler built a strong nation led by the *Volk* that stopped the process of Germany falling apart. In 1936 he was only beginning, so he had yet to return Lotharingia.

Similarly, Thoss wrote a great epic, with much more visible references to modern politics. He made Henry into a Hitler-like figure, a ruler, who returned Germany to its glory. He made the source narrative fit his ideological construction. The friendship between ruler and the ruled was to be based on the ancient traditions. The *amicitia* pacts, while never named so, were something that made Henry's Reich different from the West Frankish kingdom. They succeeded not only because of the politics of the King, but also, it is implied, thanks to Germans' superior blood.

Holtzmann described things slightly differently. After being chosen by the Franks and the Saxons, Henry moved to reacquire control over Swabia and Bavaria. In the latter duchy Arnulf was chosen by his men to be their king. Henry had some troubles at the beginning so first he moved into Swabia, as an easier target. Its *Dux* Burchard was in a state of recurring war with Burgundy. Therefore, Henry was able to make peace without a battle and subdue him quite easily. This was supported by Henry's decision to give the *Dux* fairly large autonomy in his reign over the duchy and the Church there. This enabled Burchard to concentrate on Rudolph and at the same time protect the borders of the Reich. As for Bavaria, at first Henry claimed substantial losses, but was soon able to subjugate it and offered Arnulf even better terms than Burchard by giving him complete control over the bishoprics there. Holtzmann did not mention that this was based on Liudprand's information and instead there are many quotes from and references to Widukind. Interestingly, Holtzmann downplayed the *amicitia*, which for him was taken from Roman tradition and did not apply to the tenth century. Still, it is clear that for him regaining Lotharingia was an important step in constructing and rebuilding Germany.⁶⁶

Diwald depicted Burchard and Arnulf not only as Henry's enemies, but also accomplices of the Hungarians, who they encouraged to attack Saxony. Henry was ready to fight, but before that, he had to stabilise his rule. First was Burchard, who remained in conflict with Rudolph of Burgundy. They

66 Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 72-73, 75.

fought a border war and if the *Dux* wanted to win it, he had to concentrate all his strength against Rudolph. Henry was happy for this conflict as it not only weakened Burchard, but also tied up his forces in the south. This was why the *Dux* soon made an homage and accepted Henry as a king. He did so voluntarily, which contrasts with Conrad's military attempts. Burchard was unable to fight the King, as he was weakened and the Hungarian raids were taking their toll.⁶⁷

Arnulf, on the other hand, was a more difficult problem. Diwald noted that he became *dux* at a young age after his father died in battle. He was somewhat immature, and while it could be seen that Bavaria under his reign wanted to be independent, when Arnulf fought against Conrad, he did so not against Reich, but against a king. Diwald doubted that *Dux* seriously wanted to become a king. Describing the fight between Arnulf and Henry, he followed Liudprand, slavishly quoting the poem-speech. It is clear that he liked this story. There is a reason for that, aside from literary merit. Diwald stressed that Henry peacefully convinced Arnulf to surrender, making him a special king who respects the *Stämme*. When it came to Lotharingia, Henry had to be cautious and use different ways of incorporating it into his kingdom. This tactic of carefully planned and executed military operations and diplomacy not only made Lotharingia his, but also stabilised and pacified the duchy. While acknowledged the great role of the *Stämme*, Diwald made it clear that this did not mean that they could acquire independence. They were parts of Germany.⁶⁸ By making Swabians almost equals to Saxons, the 'rivalry was replaced by solidarity'.⁶⁹ Here the kingdom was an 'organism', not steered from centre.⁷⁰

Althoff was keen on *amicitia* pacts. Writing about relations between the King and the *duces*, he concentrated on the friendship between them. The Saxon king was to accept that the *duces* would control and rule over their churches and also would leave them space for independent policies. This was done either because of an understanding that the internal conflicts could last much longer, or because there was a foreign danger. Althoff noted that the ability to compromise was something that made Henry stand out, not only from his predecessors, but also from his western neighbour. Such a view resembles the ideas of Thoss, but here the nationalistic elements are absent.⁷¹

67 Diwald, *Heinrich*, p. 314, 316-18

68 Diwald, *Heinrich*, p. 317, 323-27, 361-70.

69 'Rivalität wurde ersetzt durch Solidarität', Diwald, *Heinrich*, p. 321

70 'Organismus', Diwald, *Heinrich*, p. 330

71 Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 42-45.

After Althoff presented the chronology of peacemaking, he noted that afterwards Burchard was present at the court in Seelheim in 920.⁷² Thoss made an identical point.⁷³ In writing his text, Althoff was even more influenced by Widukind than Lüdtkke and Thoss were. He made a passing reference to the duel narrative only as an example of a deformed narrative about the past.⁷⁴

As for Lotharingia, Althoff stated that the duchy became a part of the Western Frankish kingdom in 911, after the election of Conrad. Althoff pointed at Henry's peacemaking. The conflict with Charles the Simple was a situation where no one wanted to wage war and this was the reason for the cessation of military operations. Althoff never mentioned that Germany was thus reunited. He stressed that Lotharingia was not conquered, but that it fell under Henry's yoke because of the will of its ruler and people. It took some time till Lotharingia became a part of Henry's kingdom, which shows that there were hardly any long term plans for the conquest.⁷⁵

When Althoff wrote about Henry again, he noted that the Saxon king used the conflict between Burchard of Swabia and Rudolph of Burgundy to subjugate Burchard, but, nevertheless, he gave the *Dux* much autonomy. On the other hand, Arnulf of Bavaria clearly wanted to be an anti-king. Even though he was defeated by Henry, he accepted his rule after being granted control over the bishoprics in his duchy.⁷⁶

In Giese's book, Henry used the conflict between Burchard and Rudolph to subjugate *Dux*, leaving him large autonomy. As for Bavaria, Giese concentrated more on the question of the reliability of the information about Arnulf's kingship, but in his description of events, he generally followed the historical consensus. While for him Henry was more approachable for the *duces*, and tried to mediate with them, he still gave the interests of the kingdom primacy. That is why he set up Hermann as a *Dux* of Swabia after Burchard's death. When writing about Lotharingia, he concentrated on the facts and it seems that the duchy has no special value in his book.⁷⁷

In their discussion of Henry's reign the textbooks operate on certain assumptions about the chronicles, with Widukind as the main source. Liudprand is relegated to the author of a fancy tale that at best can be used to note the character of the King. The lack of interest in *Antapodosis* leads

72 Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 46.

73 Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 72.

74 Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 41-42.

75 Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 47-52.

76 Althoff and Keller, *Die Zeit*, p. 119-21.

77 Giese, *Heinrich*, p. 70-76, 78-93.

to their missing the very valuable ideological points Liudprand made. Henry was a *rex pacificus*, a *rex christianus*. He stood out as a king interested only in protecting his Christian subjects. Such a description explains the chronicle's disdain for other rulers and its particularly nasty vision of Italian affairs. Widukind is more interested in political affairs. Here the difference of descriptions between the two chroniclers comes from them using different motifs to create an image of a glorified king.

4 Otto I and the Rebellion of 937-939

The description of the first rebellion of Otto's reign is the longest continuous narrative about the East Frankish king in *Antapodosis*. Liudprand constructed a very detailed image, where he was able to make him a special ruler superior in his qualities over all others. When looking at the historiographical representation of this conflict, it began soon after the coronation. Various members of the kingdom's elite began to conspire almost at the same time. Arnulf of Bavaria's sons opposed the limiting of their power, while Wichmann Billung felt omitted by the King when the command of the Saxon army was given to his younger brother Gero.

But the most important part of the rebellion began when the *Dux* Eberhard joined with Thankmar, Otto's older brother, who rebelled because he did not acquire any inheritance from his mother's family. These two men began to attack the ruler, capturing his younger brother Henry. After the rebels' first success, Otto moved with his forces and defeated Thankmar, who was later killed when he sought refuge in a church. After this, Eberhard made peace with the King, but after a short exile, he returned to wage war again, this time with the help of Henry and the *Dux* of Lotharingia, Gisbert.

1 Reasons for Rebellion

In *Antapodosis*, Otto's rule begins violently. Soon after his ascension there was a great rebellion, in which his younger brother Henry participated. This is different in *Res Gestae*. In Widukind's chronicle there is a much longer time span between the coronation and the first internal struggles. Before the rebellion, Otto subjugated Bohemia and had expeditions to 'the barbarian nations'.¹ The internal dissent begins between the ninth and tenth chapter of the second book. Both texts also differ in that Liudprand never mentioned other rebels apart from Eberhard, Gisbert of Lotharingia, and Henry. For Hrotsvit, before the civil war broke out, there was peace throughout the kingdom in contrast to war-torn foreign lands.² This is a motif of a peaceful land where no discord can take place. Peace can be

1 'Barbaras nationes', Widukind II Incipiunt capitula.; Bachrach, p. 67; These fights were against Redarii, cf. Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 115-16; Bachrach, *Warfare*, p. 43.

2 Hrotsvit, *Gesta Ottonis*, line 160-63.

connected with the rule of a certain king and it seems that this is what happened here.³

The most elaborate explanation for the rebellion is provided by Widukind. Henry and Thankmar are joined in a fight by Gisbert and Eberhard. They are present during the Aachen coronation, where the *duces* served the King and bishops at the table after the main ceremony. There Gisbert was responsible for everything, as Aachen was in his duchy and Eberhard 'looked after the table'.⁴ This great honour highlighted Eberhard and Gisbert's positions in the kingdom.⁵

3 Cf. Bede Venerabilis who wrote that King Edwin's kingdom was so peaceful, that a woman with a newborn child could walk from one side of the island to the other. There is an idea that this was a reference to the protection against rapes and other crimes of sexual nature; Bede Venerabilis, *Historia ecclesiastica*, II.16; Herrmann, *Die Heldensagen*, 2, p. 377-78; Saunders, *Rape*, p. 42.

A king making his kingdom peaceful was a popular theme in English sources. William of Malmesbury stated that Alfred made it so that there was no thievery throughout the kingdom; William of Malmesbury, *De gestis regum*, II.122. Dorothy Whitelock noted that this was to become a standard mark of a good king; Whitelock, 'William', p. 84-85. For this (with special attention to roads), see Rouse, *The Idea*, p. 105-09; for Irish examples, see Cross, *Motif-index*, p. 34. Hrotsvit most probably was referencing here 1 Kings 4.24-25, where Solomon is described as a ruler who protects all inhabitants.

4 'Mensae preerat', Widukind II.2; Bachrach, p. 64.

5 Althoff saw this as a way of changing the system of rule. There are other examples of such service for kings, like Ladislav I *Dux* of Bohemia who was *pincerna* – *cup-bearer* during Henry V's wedding in the *Anonymous imperial chronicle* ad 1114 (Frutolf, *Chronicon*, p. 248; McCarthy, p. 213). On the text see Frutolf and Eccardus, *Chronicles*, p. 56-58; Dale, 'Imperial'. On service see Althoff, *Amicitia und pacta*, p. 92-93; Althoff and Witthöft, 'Les services', p. 1302-03, 1306; Hlaváček, 'Die böhmische', p. 86 note 15. *Pincerna* could be an honorary title; Widukind II.11.

In many narratives there are *duces* serving the king; Althoff and Witthöft, 'Les services', p. 1312-15. Thietmar wrote that Otto III was served by the nobles at the table during Easter celebrations in Quedlinburg 986: 'Henry at his table, Conrad as chamberlain, Henry the Younger cellarer, Bernhard as marshal'; 'Heinricus ad mensam, Conrad ad cameram, Hezil ad cellarium, Bernhardus equis preluit', Thietmar, *Chronik*, IV.9; Warner, p. 156; cf. Uhlirz, *Jahrbücher*, 2, p. 69-70. This is reminiscent of Widukindian: 'Duke Gisbert, whose authority encompassed this place, obtained all of the supplies. Eberhard looked after the table. Hermann the Frank served as cup-bearer. Arnulf was responsible for overseeing the horses and choosing the place to make camp'; 'Isilberhtus, ad cuius potestatem locus ille pertinebat, omnia procurabat; Evurhardus mensae preerat, Herimannus Franco pincernis, Arnulfus equestri ordini et eligendis locandisque castris preerat', Widukind II.2; Bachrach, p. 64. For other examples of such feasts see Wolf, *Die Entstehung*, p. 84 note 151. For the posts see Hincmar of Reims, *De ordine palatii*, c. 16 line 275-79, c. 22-23 line 362-94 and p. 70 note 159, p. 73 note 167, p. 74 note 170, p. 75 note 171; cf. Jaeger, *The Origins*, p. 20.

The coronation feast was present in Golden Bull where the aim of celebration was to show a harmony and to express what Michail Bojcov has called an 'abstract Idea of Roman Empire'

The latter took Otto's sister as a wife.⁶ There were other examples of such a marriage policy by Saxon kings, like the marriage of Burchard III of Swabia and Hedwig, Otto's niece.⁷

2 Similarities and Main Differences in the Descriptions of the Rebellion Found in Sources

Before discussing the narratives in details, the more general differences should be presented. Both Widukind and Liudprand concentrated on the fact that Henry participated in the rebellion and played an important role in it. Liudprand first wrote that Henry became the King's enemy at

('abstrakten Idee des Römischen Reiches'), *Bulla Aurea Karoli IV.*, c. 27; Bojcov, 'Okkasionelles', p. 493-94.

In *Sachsenspiegel* Count Palatine of the Rhine was a *steward* (*rikes druzte*), the *Dux* of Saxony was a *marshal*, or rather constable (*marschalk*), Margrave of Brandenburg was a *chamberlain* (*dridde de kamerere*) and the King of Bohemia a *butler* (*scenke des rikes*) at the emperor's table; *Sachsenspiegel* III 57§ 2; Dobozy, p. 130-31; cf. Althoff and Witthöft, 'Les services', p. 1310; Erkens, *Kurfürsten*, p. 2-3, 30-31. The service of the *duces* was meant as a sign of unity; Kannowski, 'The impact', p. 17-21; cf. Schmidt-Wiegand, 'Wahl und Weihe', p. 228-30; Wolf, *Die Entstehung*, p. 14 and 85; Wolf, 'Von den Königswahlen'.

Arthurian Bedivere and Kay, respectively a butler and a steward, were very close to the King and held other posts in the kingdom, either earls or counts, depending on the version of the story. They were also commanders of Arthur's troops. See Gowans, *Cei*, p. 134; see also Grisward, *Archéologie*, p. 264-78. The exact duties of Key and Bedivere changed between narratives. In *The Knight of the Two Swords* Kay is responsible for the table, Lucan for wine and Bedivere is a constable; *Le Chevalier as deus espees*, v. 123-25 and 11900-03 (in older edition by Wendelin Foerster – *Li chevaliers as deus espees* – v. 11894-97). Example of service at the table is in Malory's *Le Morte Darthur*, where at the wedding of Sir Gareth and Lady Lionesse knights ask to serve at their table (Malory, *Le Morte*, VII.35); cf. Kennedy, *Knighthood*, p. 51-52. Arthurian tales were also played out as Round Table Tournaments and Kay also played a role there: Barber, 'Why did Edward III?', p. 90-92.

Therefore, it has to be said that service at the king's table was not seen as something humiliating, but was perceived as a great honour; Banaszkiewicz, 'Włócznia i chorągiew', p. 13-14, 16.

6 It is clear that Henry gave her in marriage as a way of bringing the *Dux* into an allegiance; Keller, 'Reichsstruktur', p. 105-08; Lubich, *Verwandtsein*, p. 80-81, 204; about Gerberga see Colonna, 'Figure femminili', p. 41-42. A wife from the royal line was important, as it gave some of her splendour to the man, cf. Laudage, 'Hausrecht', p. 28-29. Giving women from the dynasty in marriage to a subject could be dangerous as was later noted. After Conrad the Red's rebellion only one Ottonian girl married a royal subject and this was in special situation; Leyser, *Rule*, p. 27-28.

7 Still, there were more spectacular marriages which became of interest to scholars. See Tomaszek, *Klasztor*; Banaszkiewicz, 'Jak Erenfried Ezzo'.

the instigation of some 'perverse people'.⁸ This is a similar explanation to the one given in *Res Gestae*, where Henry was coaxed into the rebellion by other men who already fought against the King. In *Vita Mathildis reginae antiquior* the whole rebellion is never mentioned. It is probably only hinted at by the information that after becoming a king, Otto took his mother's treasure and thus opened the kingdom to many sad defeats and losses.⁹

The main difference lays in the missing rebels in *Antapodosis* and Hrotsvit's *Gesta Ottonis*. One of them is Thankmar. Otto was to be chosen as a successor because he was older than his brother Henry. Thankmar complicated Liudprand's idea and so had to be de-legitimised. His failing was that he was born from the wrong wife, who was sent away.¹⁰ It is doubtful that he was treated as an illegitimate son,¹¹ even through this marriage was contrary to established customs, as Hatheburg – Thankmar's mother – was a widow who took the veil after her first husband died.¹² By eliminating Thankmar from the whole text, Liudprand eliminated the difficult question of the rules of succession. As there is no older brother, there is no question of why he was overlooked. In this way Otto could be described as the legitimate successor. If Thankmar appeared in the text, it would lead to the question over whether he, as the oldest son, should be a king. Liudprand wrote him and the problem off. Also, Thankmar's gruesome death left a bloody mark on Otto. He was killed in a church near the altar after he had surrendered. It is clear that this was criticised.¹³ Therefore, this could be an additional reason for leaving him out of the chronicle, as it was dangerously reminiscent of how Liudprand described Italian affairs.

Thankmar's known reason for rebellion was highly problematic for Liudprand: Thankmar's mother was the maternal aunt of count Siegfried of Merseburg, who died soon after Otto's coronation. Because of that he expected to inherit the title and lands of the count, but the King gave it to Gero, who was Siegfried's younger brother.¹⁴ Leyser noted clear differences

8 'Quorundam perversorum', *Antapodosis* IV.18; Squatriti, p. 153.

9 *VMra*, c. 5.

10 This situation was also very difficult for other authors, for example Adalbert wrote that Thankmar was in fact a son of a concubine (Regino of Prüm ad 939). Cf. Schmid, 'Die Thronfolge', p. 486 note 224.

11 Widukind calls his mother a 'noble' ('nobili') and noted the good standing of her, Widukind II.11; Bachrach, p. 72.

12 Thietmar, *Chronik* I.5-6, 9 (6); Leyser, *Rule*, p. 12-13; Thietmar, *Ottoman Germany*, p. 29; Bagge, *Kings*, p. 173.

13 Cf. Thietmar, *Chronik* II.2; for Thankmar see also Schmid, 'Die Thronfolge', p. 490-91, 494.

14 Widukind II.9.

between Thankmar's and Henry's rebellions. In a way he rehabilitated the former since he could rightly feel cheated of his mother's inheritance. He acquired what Henry I wrote off to him, but nothing of his mother's estate.¹⁵

Otto's problems in Bavaria are almost absent from *Res Gestae* and *Antapodosis*. Widukind gives only rather vague statements. Arnulf's sons did not want to stand before Otto, and Widukind noted their 'arrogance'.¹⁶ In other sources the main conflict was over the control of the Bavarian Church. It was taken back by Otto after Arnulf's death. His sons were forced to accept what Dümmler and Köpke called a strengthening of the kingdom.¹⁷ Holtzmann, on the other hand, saw Otto as being in a situation where he had to act harshly for the greater good of the Reich. He had to break the power of Bavaria, as Henry did with Swabia. Therefore, Otto could accept them as Arnulf's successors only after he would regain the control over the bishoprics. Arnulf's sons refused and conflict ensued. While the King acted according to the hopes and wishes of the Church, according to Holtzmann, he did so for the greater good and interests of the Reich.¹⁸ Similarly, in Otto's biography, he stated that the King's control over the Church limited the Bavarian trend for independence.¹⁹

Günter wrote that Arnulf's sons had to accept that the King now controlled the Church in the duchy. At the same time he added that the laws and feelings of the Bavarians were protected and added that the *Dux* Berthold, who ruled Bavaria after Eberhard, was one of the closest allies of the King, as at some point he was even offered the ruler's sister as a wife.²⁰ Althoff, on other hand, never mentioned that control over the Bavarian Church returned to the King.²¹ He probably followed Widukind and Liudprand, who mostly ignored this conflict.

The question of why Liudprand never mentioned Wichmann Billung and his rebellion is more complicated.²² It could be connected to the fact that Wichmann was the only rebel, about whom there is no tale of his wish to become a king. He acted on his being passed over when the command

15 Leyser, *Rule*, p. 12-13; cf. Thietmar, *Ottonian Germany*, p. 30.

16 'Superbia', Widukind II.8; Bachrach, p. 69; cf. Giese, *Der Stamm*, p. 117.

17 Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 79-80.

18 Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 119.

19 Holtzmann, *Kaiser*, p. 30-31.

20 Günter, *Kaiser*, p. 40; about Gerberga see Brühl, *Deutschland--Frankreich*, p. 478-79.

21 Cf. Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 79-80.

22 Wichmann was either married to the sister of Queen Mathilda, or was connected to her family in some other way; Althoff, *Adels*, p. 38-39, 73-74.

of the Saxon army was given to his younger brother Hermann.²³ This was seen by scholars as an example of Otto's acting against the general rules of the kingdom and it was a part of his shaping the new kingdom.²⁴ According to Widukind, it was more personal feud than an attack on the style of rule.²⁵

Liudprand and Widukind looked at the civil war differently. Widukind wrote more a detailed account of the civil wars. Liudprand, on the other hand, wanted to show how peaceful and good the King was, compared to other rulers. This different attitude explains why Widukind did not skip even terrifying elements of the war as Thankmar's death at the altar of the church of Saint Peter at Herseberg. To enlarge the tragedy, he even noted that the temple was dedicated by Pope Leo.²⁶ The overall description is grim. Thankmar's death, especially in such conditions, was highly unfortunate for Otto. It could lead some men loyal to Thankmar to join arms with the rebels in hope for revenge.²⁷ Nevertheless, Widukind never ran away from such a difficult subject. Liudprand followed a different plan and never noted anything like this.

Therefore, in *Res gestae* there is more thorough description of the war with all its brutality and blood. *Antapodosis* has its own share of violence, but Liudprand had to describe battles in another way if he wanted to show the difference between weak Italian kings and the Ottonians.

3 Concept of Porphyrogenitus

In the context of the overall construction there is an important question of Henry's motives for his rebellion. In *Antapodosis* there are bad people around him who urge him to stand up against his brother and questioned Otto's right to rule. These men put forward a case that Henry should become a king, as he was born 'into the royal station'.²⁸ It is difficult to assert whether the concept that heirs to the kingship should be born to a

23 Widukind II.4.

24 Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 116; cf. reasons for passing on Thankmar: Bernhardt, *Itinerant*, p. 18.

25 Widukind II.4, 11. For the overview of the conflict see Althoff, *Adels-*, p. 77-94.

26 Widukind II.11.

27 Leyser, *Rule*, p. 14.

28 'In dignitate genito', *Antapodosis* IV.18; Squatriti, p. 153.

king was popular, or not.²⁹ Nevertheless, it appears in *Antapodosis* in the context of Porphyrogenitus.³⁰

This concept needs some explanation. An emperor's son born in the Great Palace (specifically in the Porphyry Chamber; Liudprand calls the whole palace Porphyra) was known under this name. Liudprand explains that the palace was built by Constantine the Great with the idea that his children should be born there.³¹ In this way they would receive a great and special title that would make them stand out. Liudprand, who wrote about this in the beginning of *Antapodosis*, later in the third book repeated chapters concerned with Byzantine affairs including the one on the Porphyrogenitus title, to which an additional statement was added that the term does not mean the one born in the Imperial station, but only those born in the palace.³² Even without this assessment, the information itself has a somewhat negative implication. It is branded as Byzantine and could easily be read as a wrong.³³ Liudprand thus asserted that the Porphyrogenitus should not be confused with Henry and idea itself was not good.

A corresponding version of Otto's ascent can be found in *Vita Mathildis reginae posterior* where 'senior leaders' gather to discuss who should succeed Henry. There are two candidates: Otto on the account of his age and better understanding of justice and judgement and Henry, who being 'born in the

29 For example, see the case of Grimoald and his two sons, the older Romuald and the younger Garibald, who inherited the kingdom; Paul the Deacon, *Historia gentis Langobardorum*, V.1, 33. Cf. Schneider, *Königswahl*, p. 44-46. For the importance of wives with such a background, see Shepard, 'Courts', p. 29-30.

Eadmer of Canterbury wrote that after the death of King Edgar the Peaceful his son Edward inherited the kingdom. It was, as he called it, 'hereditary right' – 'haereditario iure' (Eadmer of Canterbury, *Vita Dunstani*, c. 59; Muir and Turner, p. 145), but some people opposed him because not only he was a very strict man, but while also born from a legally married woman, both Queen and Edgar were not at that time consecrated and implicitly – as this is never said by Eadmer – his brother Æthelred had such a background. It is probably a later addition (eleventh/twelfth century), as Byrhtgerth only noted that Edward was seen as a strict man and one who was quick to punish people (Byrhtferth of Ramsey, *Vita S. Oswaldi*, IV.18).

Eadmer did not promote the 'born in purple' concept since on seeing how well he reigned those who opposed Edward changed their minds; cf. Jones, 'The Significance', p. 381. On legitimacy cf. Waßenhoven, 'The Role', p. 104-05; on Edward's mother see Yorke, 'Æthelwold', p. 81 note 139 and p. 82-83. Ann Williams implied a connection between this and the conflict between Otto, Henry and Porphyrogenitus concept. Williams, 'Some Notes', p. 156.

See also Stafford, 'The Reign of Æthelred II', p. 21-24; Chaney, *The Cult*, p. 25.

30 *Antapodosis* I.7, III.26, 30-31.

31 *Antapodosis* I.7, III.30-31.

32 *Antapodosis* III.30-31.

33 Rentschler, *Liudprand*, p. 9-17; cf. Gandino, *Il vocabolario*, p. 99-100.

royal palace' is more fitting to succeed his father. In the end, the arguments for Otto and 'God's providence' prevail³⁴

Before jumping to conclusions, it needs to be stressed that *Vita Mathildis reginae posterior* was written with Henry II in mind.³⁵ He was the descendant of Otto's younger brother and this text is seen as propaganda to have him perceived as a rightful successor. Creating a man who should be a king because of his grandfather made him better suited for the position.³⁶ It is difficult to say whether the concept of Porphyrogenitus came to *Vita Mathildis reginae posterior* only as a part of propaganda, or not. This entire problem is completely absent from Widukind's narrative, which describes young Henry as someone who desired power but without any special rights to the crown.³⁷

In *Antapodosis* there are additional elements that have to be considered in discussing Porphyrogenitus. In his note about Otto and Edith's marriage and their son Liudolf, it seems that Liudprand made a reference to the conflict with Henry.³⁸ He wrote that the marriage between them took place before the coronation and that Liudolf was born before 936. Schulmeyer-Ahl saw it as a recollection of Otto's situation, who was born before 919. Therefore, the two rebellions (Henry's and Liudolf's) are somewhat parallel stories.³⁹ This of course would be better seen if the later rebellion was actually described by Liudprand. But more important than this nit-picking is that in the whole *Antapodosis* Liudolf was clearly shown as the future king, whose death was a great misfortune. Thus, Liudprand gave another example that there is no need to be born in purple to be a king.

Schulmeyer-Ahl made an impressive analysis of the Porphyrogenitus problem,⁴⁰ but contrary to her opinions,⁴¹ there is hardly any evidence of Liudprand's interest in the promotion of this idea. According to her, there was a change between Henry's and Liudolf's rebellions. After Otto's marriage to Adelheid, the importance of being born in purple was stressed and Liudprand's information about Byzantium was to strengthen Otto II's rights

34 'Ductores primi [...] natus esset in aulia regali [...] providentia Dei', *VMrp*, c. 9, Gilsdorf, p. 100.

35 Cf. Althoff, 'Causa', p. 121-26; Bornscheuer, *Miseriae regum*, p. 60-62; Schütte, *Untersuchungen*, p. 85-93.

36 Bornscheuer, *Miseriae regum*, p. 76-79.

37 Cf. Widukind II.12. On porphyrogenitus in *Vita Mathildis reginae posterior* see Schütte, *Untersuchungen*, p. 104-10.

38 *Antapodosis* IV.17.

39 Schulmeyer-Ahl, *Der Anfang*, p. 319.

40 Schulmeyer-Ahl, *Der Anfang*, p. 320-27; cf. Leyser, *Rule*, p. 16.

41 Schulmeyer-Ahl, *Der Anfang*, p. 330-31.

to the crown. This did not stop after Liudolf's death, as he had a son, Otto.⁴² The problem with this is that it is based on information taken from other sources and a scholar's interpretations. There is not much of *Antapodosis* in the interpretation. Throughout Liudprand's work Porphyrogenitus is not presented in a positive light. The narrative is informative. Later he elaborated more on the subject and makes clear the impression that it had nothing to do with being born in purple.⁴³ Also, as there is no mention of Liudolf's rebellion in *Antapodosis*, it is impossible to seriously discuss such an interpretation.

4 Further Discussion of Reasons for Rebellion

To understand how Otto was depicted as a great ruler by Liudprand, Henry's reasons for rebellion has to be further discussed. Some scholars saw them as quite well founded in ideas of legitimacy.⁴⁴ There were many views on who should be the successor. Louis the Child, the younger son, inherited after Arnulf of Carinthia, while the older Zwentibold was passed over (but not entirely, as he was made a King of Lotharingia).⁴⁵ Some scholars even went so far as to say that all rebels against Otto had good cause based on various views about the succession,⁴⁶ but in *Antapodosis* they are clearly presented in a negative way. This was achieved by making Henry a puppet in the hands of other, evil, people called 'perverse.' The following sentence should be quoted in its entirety: 'But the one who, soon after the most noble dignity of his creation, wanted to make himself similar to his Creator, through his followers aroused Henry against the power of his brother, indeed against his king and lord, with words like these...' ⁴⁷ It is not difficult to determine who was 'the one', as it is obviously the Devil. Liudprand's phrasing is interesting here, as it seems that in a way he likens Henry's rebellion to the Devil's revolt against God. This is strengthened further on. In a poem Liudprand asks

42 Schulmeyer-Ahl, *Der Anfang*, p. 336-37.

43 Cf. Schulmeyer-Ahl, *Der Anfang*, p. 322-23.

44 Lees, 'Hrotsvit of Gandersheim', p. 15, 21. Giese, upon reading *Vita Mathildis reginae posterior*, *Vita Godehardi posterior* and one of the manuscripts of Theodorus Monachus, *Annales Palidenses* (he refers in this discussion to Waitz, *Jahrbücher* (1885), p. 173 note 1), came to the conclusion that Henry had an equal chance of becoming king; Giese, *Der Stamm*, p. 120-21.

45 Innes, *State*, p. 227-29.

46 Laudage, 'Hausrecht', p. 56.

47 'Is enim, qui post creationis suae mox clarissimam dignitatem creatori suo se similem facere voluit, per auditores suos talibus Heiricum contra fratris immo regis et domini, <potentiam> sermonibus instigavit', *Antapodosis* IV.18; Squatriti, p. 153.

whether he (either Henry, or the Devil) wants to 're-initiate the ancient duel by your guile?'⁴⁸ This should not be understood as a comparison of Otto to God, but more as a metaphor for the situation. Just like Hrotsvit, for whom Otto was protected by God, as he was an imitator of King David.⁴⁹ This is a rhetoric of power and sacralized rule, where Otto represents God and Henry the Devil.⁵⁰ Hrotsvit – just like Liudprand – connected the rebellion with the machinations of an 'ancient foe'.⁵¹ He was behind the divisions. This is a very important element. Later, in a story about Lorsch abbey discussed below, Liudprand noted that the Devil, unable to harm Otto by war, moved to different means.

Liudprand's poem directed at rebels⁵² begins with the question for Henry, why he has a 'youthful craving' to acquire the crown.⁵³ The idea that passion for power is wrong has already been extensively discussed. Henry's reasons for rebellion have to be confronted with Otto's basis for legitimacy. It comes from his father's wish, but it was carried out with God's advice. Therefore, young Henry's actions are not only against his father's decision, but also against God. Liudprand made the rebels against the rightful king into rebels against God. In this way the ruler and the social order are sacred. This is reminiscent of the poem-speech directed at Arnulf of Bavaria.⁵⁴ There, Henry I pointed at God as the one who not only was behind his rise, but also was responsible for everything that would happen, which fits

48 'Antiquum renovare tua iam fraude duellum?', *Antapodosis* IV.19; Squatriti, p. 153; cf. Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft*, p. 54-55. The pact with devil and magic were banned throughout Middle Ages, cf. *Capitulatio de partibus Saxoniae*, c. 6. See also Angenendt, *Geschichte*, p. 624-25.

This part of Liudprand's poem was seen by Chiesa and Bougard also as possible reference to Cain and Abel, Liutprando, *Antapodosis*, p. 510; Liudprand, *Liudprand*, p. 495 note 87.

49 Hrotsvit, *Gesta Ottonis*, line 251-55.

50 Cf. Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft*, p. 54-55.

51 'Antiqui mala [...] inimici', Hrotsvit, *Gesta Ottonis*, line 166-67; Bergman, p. 53. There is some dissenting opinion on the words used here by Hrotsvit. Lees noted that this was in fact a trick on her behalf to take the attention of the implied criticism of Otto to be seen in the text. She was to blame him for the rebellion and other mistakes. While Hrotsvit used a devilish image as an institution responsible for all evil in her other works, in Lees' opinion she made it more concrete and embodied elsewhere; Lees, 'David', p. 216-17 and note 67 on p. 217. I disagree with this. It is possible that there is some criticism of Otto in *Gesta*, but this interpretation is drawn out and forced. The style and presentation of the reasons for the rebellion clearly shows that Hrotsvit was against the rebels. For how the Devil was used by Hrotsvit in her plays, see Silber, 'Hrotsvit and the Devil'.

52 For overall analysis of it, see Colonna, *Le poesie*, p. 173-84.

53 'Iuventum [...] cupido', *Antapodosis* IV.19; Squatriti, p. 153. The whole line is inspired by Virgil's *Georgics*, where he addressed his poem to Julius Caesar and marked his fall; Vergilius, *Georgicon*, I.25-37.

54 *Antapodosis* II. 22.

with Liudprand's broader notion of a divine order that governs man's life. Therefore, there is only one king and no rebel can usurp his title.

The impression of repetition is strengthened by Liudprand asking the young rebel if he wants to fight his brother. Here Henry is accused of acting against family. While it is not stated directly, it might be a reference to Cain and Abel. The invocation about the reinvigoration of the ancient duel might have been a reference to both God's struggle with Devil and the murder of Abel.⁵⁵ The criticism of violence among the family had a long tradition.⁵⁶

An example of this can be found, when after Louis the Pious' death three brothers – Charles the Bald, Louis the German, and Lothar – fought for domination and their father's inheritance. This led to the battle of Fontenoy, where many men fell. Afterwards one of the warriors, Engelbert (Angelbert), who fought in Lothar's army, wrote a poem about what happened that day. It is quite an unsettling text, where members of the same family killed each other.⁵⁷ Such a grim view of this battle also appears in Audradus' *Book of Revelations*. He views it and its aftermath as a punishment for the sins of the people. The complex war over Louis' inheritance became a family struggle⁵⁸ in the vein of *The Lay of Hildebrand*.⁵⁹ Engelbert noted in a poem that Lothar's traitors acted like Judas Iscariot.⁶⁰

John VIII wrote in his letters about the conflict between Charles the Bald and his brother's son, Louis the Younger. In the first letter, he wanted the bishops of the West Frankish kingdom to remain loyal to Charles. When it failed and some of them supported Louis, he wrote another letter, in which he accused them of acting like Judas Iscariot; Cain was also brought up as an example. In a letter to the bishops of the Eastern Frankish kingdom he compares Louis' actions to the murder of Abel.⁶¹

55 Liutprando de Cremona, *La Antapódosis*, p. 123 note 74.

56 Cf. Dutton, *The Politics*, p. 113-14.

57 Angelbert, *Versus de bella*; cf. Dutton, *The Politics*, p. 118-20; cf. Nelson, 'The Search for Peace', p. 99-100, 101.

58 Audradus, *Liber Revelationum*, fragment II; cf. Dutton, *The Politics*, p. 140-41. For Audradus see also Mohr, 'Audradus'.

59 Of course *Hildebrandlied* contains much more than just the fight between father and son *Das Hildebrandlied*; Udwin, *Between*, p. 6-7; Hoffmann, 'Das Hildebrandslied', p. 28-30; Murdoch, *The Germanic Hero*, p. 35-38; Bornscheuer, *Miseriae regum*, p. 17.

60 Angelbert, *Versus de bella*, line 5.

61 *Iohannis VIII. papae epistolae*, no 5, 6, 7. For the conflict: Nelson, 'Violence in the Carolingian World', p. 101-03; cf. Nelson, 'The Search for Peace', p. 112. On Cain and Abel see Breyfogle, 'Citizenship', p. 516. See also Allman, 'Sin', p. 37-40. About John VIII and his political ideas see Ullmann, *The Growth*, p. 219-24.

In Cosmas' chronicle Wirpirk, wife of the then future Conrad I, *Dux* of Bohemia, goes to his brother, King Vratislav II, in secrecy after he attacks his brother. She stands up in front of the King to plead her guilt for the conflict and argues that the battle will not solve anything, and it is wrong to attack one's own people. If he continues to fight, he could end up being known as another Cain.⁶²

In the poem in *Antapodosis* which has already been discussed there is a long section calling Henry various names: 'wrong, cruel, and unfair one', 'impious one, Leviathan, behemoth' and 'wretch', but it is possible this was indeed an invocation at the devil.⁶³ If the former interpretation is correct, then it should be seen as an extremely strong attack. Kings were sometimes attacked in such a harsh way, some were even proud of their 'evil' background, like Richard the Lionheart, but here such an accusation astonishes, as it does not fit the overall description of Henry.⁶⁴ Liudprand, when he first mentioned Henry in his discussion of Henry I's sons, made him look like a good person. Here he is wretched scum and a villain. Liudprand often used harsh names to attack his enemies. For example, in his description of the Formosus affair in which Pope Sergius III removed the corpse of his predecessor from his grave and put it on trial; he then deposed and later re-ordained everyone who was ordained by Formosus.⁶⁵ Liudprand informed Recemund that it was wrong to do so, as even those who were appointed by Judas Iscariot never lost their ordinations after his betrayal, unless they themselves committed a crime.⁶⁶ Leviathan appears also in an attack against Manasses' claim that he could have held many bishoprics and secular posts. Liudprand not only wrote that he acted under the devil's instigation, but also referred to Leviathan's temptation of Christ.⁶⁷ Nevertheless, while the devil appears as the driving force of evil acts, Henry is the only person he calls a Behemoth.⁶⁸

62 Cosmas of Prague, *Chronica Boemorum*, II.45.

63 'Fallax, crudelis, inique? Impie, Leviathan, Behemoth [...] Improbe', *Antapodosis* II.19; Squatriti, p. 153.

64 See Giraldus Cambrensis, *De Principis Instructione Liber*, III.27; cf. Broughton, *The Legends*, p. 78-86 and 11-12; 46-48.

65 *Antapodosis* I.30; It was Stephen VI, not Sergius III, who ruled after Formosus; see Leyser, 'Episcopal', p. 800-02; cf. Zimmermann, 'Papstabsetzungen'.

66 *Antapodosis* I.30; the problem with ordinations was broader than Liudprand noted. Pope, who condemned Formosus, was elected by those ordained by him. If his ordinations were invalid, then the question of the validity of Stephen's office could be asked; Heckmann, 'Der Fall', p. 230-32.

67 *Antapodosis* IV.6-7.

68 For Behemoth, see Colonna, *Le poesie*, p. 180 for the meaning of the word Behemoth and Leviathan, and p. 210 for the similar – devilish – connotations of *inique*.

If this was indeed addressed at the devil, then it should be seen as a part of a longer narrative. Henry, while a rebel, is somewhat innocent. He joined the war after being lied to and pushed into disobedience by bad advice. The devil would be accused of pushing Henry into a rebellion. Henry was still wrong, but not downright evil.

At the poem's climax, Liudprand asserts that Otto's brother will be punished in hell, in a verse inspired by Virgil's *Aeneid*.⁶⁹ In the final verses Liudprand informs Henry that he alone shall be punished, as by God's mercy others will be spared the eternal flames. It could be read as exhibiting a general theological notion that Christ's death saved mankind, but in the text it seems obvious that Liudprand wanted to express the view that surrendering to Otto protects Henry from such an end. Therefore, being a rebel leads to eternal punishment, while being loyal to the king protects one's soul.

Widukind's Henry, after being captured by Eberhard, is held in captivity for some time. He is described as a young and passionate man who had a craving for the crown. He joined Eberhard's cause and fought Otto, hoping to acquire the kingdom. The whole story is much longer, as for some time after his return from captivity Henry claimed to be loyal to his brother. Only afterwards he tries to wrangle the crown from his hands.⁷⁰ After his first unsuccessful attempt, Henry's second attempt incites Lotharingia into rebellion.⁷¹

Conversely, Hrotsvit notes that both Henry and Eberhard conspired on their own with hopes of becoming kings. It was only later that Eberhard attacked Belecke and took Henry as a prisoner. He was to be used as a hostage against Otto. Moved by his grief, the King recovers Henry from Eberhard, an act which is compared to Abraham who rescued Lot from enemies. Eberhard then goes into exile, but is soon pardoned. When he returns to the kingdom, he conspires again, moving Gisbert and Henry into rebellion. Henry promised to help them, as they offered the crown in exchange, but Hrotsvit hoped that he was in some way forced to do this.⁷²

A different explanation for the conflict can be found in *Vita Mathildis reginae posterior*. Its author recognised the problem of the legitimisation of Otto's rule. The two brothers are not getting along well and a division between them grows stronger. There are also people who dislike Henry and

69 Vergilius, *Aeneid*, VI.404; cf. Colonna, *Le poesie*, p. 182.

70 Widukind II.12.

71 Widukind II.15.

72 Hrotsvit, *Gesta Ottonis*, line 173-88, 191-201, 206-25; *Gen.* 14.14-16.

try to hurt him. There are major quarrels in the family and it seems that there is no 'peaceful word' between the two brothers. Mathilda defends Henry from bad words spread by his enemies. There are things intentionally not mentioned as the list of them is 'excessive'.⁷³ Such vague expressions obscure the account of the civil war. After some time an agreement is made because Jesus wanted peace between brothers. Thus, with the help of their mother Mathilda, peace was achieved and Henry becomes the *Dux* of Bavaria.⁷⁴ *Vita Mathildis reginae posterior*'s author had an example for obfuscating the war between brothers, as *antiquior* also never mentions it.⁷⁵

In *Antapodosis*, evil men push Henry to rebellion. Liudprand later explains who they are. Otto's younger brother rebels because of Eberhard for whom Henry is only a ploy to defeat the current ruler. Giselbert joins the struggle because of his wife Gerberga's ambitions for him to become king.⁷⁶ Liudprand adds that this was also Eberhard's objective. He tells his wife privately – this makes his confession stronger⁷⁷ – that now she holds a *dux*, but that soon it will be a king in her hands, despite the fact that he has promised Giselbert to help him in becoming king.⁷⁸ Liudprand painted

73 'Pacificum [...] prolixa', *VMrp*, c. 9, Gilsdorf, p. 100.

74 *VMrp*, c. 9; cf. Schmid, 'Neue Quellen', p. 201 note 66.

75 *VMra*, c. 5.

76 *Antapodosis* IV.21-22.

77 This problem and how Liudprand used such a rhetorical attribute still needs a study of his own.

78 *Antapodosis* IV.23; Heinrich Fichtenau argued that Gerberga was responsible for her husband's rebellion; Fichtenau, *Living*, p. 106. She would be similar to Fastrada, who is described by Einhard as having had influence on Charlemagne and that her cruelty provoked at least two rebellions; Einhard, *Vita Karoli*, c. 20; cf. Nelson, *The Frankish*, p. 235; cf. Garver, *Women*, p. 164. Another example is Eadburh, who influenced her husband King Beorhtric of Wessex to execute many people whom she disliked (Asser, *Life of King Alfred*, c. 14).

Orderic Vitalis wrote many similar stories: Helwise pushed her husband William Count of Évreux into a war against Ralph of Tosny because his wife Isabel of Conches made some damaging remarks about her; Emma, wife of Richard of Fresnel, made her husband rebel against the King; Orderic Vitalis, *The ecclesiastical history*, VIII.14 (iii.345), XII.13 (iv.343); cf. Truax, 'From Bede', p. 43 note 45. There is a general pattern in the discussion of the role of women as the provokers of evil acts, which could be a way of obscuring the role of men; Chibnall, *The World*, p. 195.

This is quite different from Liudprand, for whom Gerberga showed how the civil war began because of the ambition of the rebels. Compare this with how Theodora together with her daughter ruled Rome (*Antapodosis*, II.48, III.43-44). On a first impression, they look similar. In both cases women govern men and decide their position for their own good. Theodora pushed her lovers to the papal see and was behind the downfall of those who did not meet her expectations; Marozia had improper relations with popes (cf. Shaw, 'Marozia', p. 275-77). On closer examination, there is a difference; Marozia is clearly an active person. The rebels' women are much more passive. While later in *Antapodosis* Gerberga acknowledges her participation in fights against Otto, it is hardly a similar position as that of Jezebel.

an image of vast conspiracies. Eberhard inspires Gisbert to help him by promising kingship and the latter on makes a similar offer to Henry, while at the same time conspiring against him.⁷⁹ Liudprand quotes Psalm 26 (27) at this point: 'iniquity has lied to itself'.⁸⁰ The psalm is about having faith in God's providence. The narrator states his belief that God will protect him from any danger. It begins by expressing faith in God's rulings. The quotation comes from the second part, where he asks God for help, who will help him, even if he is deserted by his own family. This is followed by the quoted sentence. Its context is that the narrator is vulnerable against those who provided false accusations. Nevertheless, in the end he is confident that he will obtain God's help. The quoted line was interpreted by Augustine in a more specific way. The person should not accept iniquity's lie. Instead, he should stand steadfastly and refuse it. The prayer here asks God not to let him be under the influence of iniquity and thus remain on the side of rightfulness.⁸¹ Here Henry lets himself be lied to and by this his actions are wrong.⁸²

Later on Liudprand provides another lengthy explanation for the conflict. Eberhard and Gisbert acted upon the instigation of the 'ancient enemy'.⁸³ But their actions were not enough to harm Otto, so the devil pushed Henry into rebellion. He became a devil's weapon to crush the King. In this way Otto standing on God's side is unquestionably the good king fighting against evil. The rebels' actions are commanded by their desire for their own personal gains.⁸⁴ They act not because Otto is a bad king. There is no reference to a change of the style of the rule as a reason for their rebellion.⁸⁵ They just want power and the crown.

Liudprand, while at the same time presenting Henry as responsible for the rebellion, removes blame from him. He was deceived into leading the rebellion, but is still guilty of his naivety. Before being captured, he was loyal

Still, as Fiona Somerset pointed out to me, Eberhard's wife could be seen as acting wrongly, as while she did not conspire or act against her brother, nevertheless she became an accomplice by being entrusted with her husband's conspiracy.

79 *Antapodosis* IV.23.

80 'Mentita est iniquitas sibi', Psalm 26 (27).12; *Antapodosis* IV.23; Squatriti, p. 155.

81 Augustine of Hippo, *Enarrationes*, 26.21 enarratio II.

82 Cf. Liutprando, *Antapodosis*, p. 511.

83 'Antiquus [...] hostis', *Antapodosis* IV.28; Squatriti, p. 164.

84 Giese is clear that each rebel had his own agenda and they were joined together only through their having a common enemy. Giese based this argument on the fact that Henry was not welcomed by the Lotharingians when he became their *dux*, which shows a clear division between the rebels; Giese, *Der Stamm*, p. 118-19.

85 Cf. Liudprand of Cremona, *The Complete*, p. 154 note 43.

to the King. He helped him fight his enemies. It is only afterwards that he is influenced by Eberhard and Giselbert. In their speech to Henry they note that he was a prisoner, but if he will help them, they will make him a king.⁸⁶

That the rebels' reasons are wrong can be seen in the actions of the three Conradines: Hermann, *Dux* of Swabia, Count Udo, and Count Conrad the Wise (Kurzbold), who were Eberhard's relatives, and who remain loyal to Otto.⁸⁷ Liudprand always presents discord in a family in a negative light. Here, so that the reader would have no difficulty in seeing who was right and who was wrong, the three Conradines prefer to die with the rightful king, rather than live 'unjustly' with Eberhard.⁸⁸ This strengthens the difference between the two sides of the conflict. Henry acts against his own brother for personal gain, and he is evil because of that. Conrad, Hermann, and Udo move against their relative for the good of the state which is the only moral thing to do. In either case, a family is torn apart. In this way, Liudprand showed that Henry, while he is tricked into the rebellion, is also responsible for his actions.

Not only are the reasons for the fight wrong, but so also was the way rebels acted. During the later stage of the civil war Otto moved with his troops to Breisach to free his people from oppression, as they were being attacked by Eberhard and his soldiers.⁸⁹ Eberhard is fighting against the people, not the King. This puts him in line with many evil commanders, who ravaged the common folk. He acts in the same manner as Tedbald, who when waging a war against Greeks, was in reality acting against people and accepted patterns of behaviour.⁹⁰ Instead of fighting the army, Eberhard attacks the innocent. Otto set out not for his own gain, but to protect the oppressed. Liudprand uses similar tactics in *Historia Ottonis* where Otto leads his army into Italy not to conquer it, but to help the Italians.⁹¹ In both tales he is free of ambition. With Eberhard, the war against a rebellion to reclaim power over his kingdom is changed into a war in defence of his people. This changes the outlook of the war and destroys the image of the *Dux*, even further elevating the king's image.

86 *Antapodosis* IV.20, 22.

87 *Antapodosis* IV.23. All of them shared a grandfather; see Hlawitschka, *Konradiner-Genealogie*, p. 16-17.

88 'Iniuste', *Antapodosis* IV.23; Squatriti, p. 155. This concept is often present in other sources. Charles the Bald's men preferred to die than betray him (*Nithardi Historiarum libri IIII*, II.4; cf. Nelson, 'The Search for Peace', p. 106). Conversely, Engelbert (Angelbert), in his poem about Fontenoy, criticises those *duces* who betrayed Lothar; Angelbert, *Versus de bella*; Stone, *Morality*, p. 95-96; Bachrach, *Early Carolingian*, p. 134.

89 *Antapodosis* IV.27.

90 *Antapodosis* IV.10. On this, see Grabowski, 'From Castration to Misogyny'.

91 *Historia Ottonis* 1.

In *Res Gestae* the reasons behind the conflict between Eberhard and Otto are completely different. There are no references to a claim for the throne. The tale begins not with the ambitions of the *Dux*, but with Eberhard's anger, as he attacks the city Elmeri (Hellmern) and slaughtered its inhabitants. It is governed by a certain Bruning with whom Eberhard begins a feud, for unknown reasons. The previous sentence has Widukind explaining that the Saxons, because of their king's glory, refused to be the vassals of other nations. It seems that this is a form of explanation for why Bruning refused some kind of servitude toward Eberhard, and how this would provoke the *Dux's* anger. The traditional interpretation present from Köpke to Althoff was challenged by Thomas Zotz in his review of Althoff and Keller's older book on the Ottonians.⁹² Zotz notes that Widukind's text could be read in such a way that Bruning was not Eberhard's vassal, but one of the King's men.⁹³ Whatever is behind it, when Otto hears about the actions of the Franconian *dux*, he orders Eberhard to give him a number of horses equal to the price of 100 silver talents. Also, those who are the *Dux's* commanders (*principes militum*) are to walk to Magdeburg carrying dogs.⁹⁴ There they are met, greeted, forgiven and later sent away by the King who at that time is translating the relics of martyr Innocent. The punishment of bringing dogs in hands is known from the other sources, but its exact meaning is difficult to explain. Jacob Grimm saw in it a form of substitute punishment for disrespectful behaviour or slander. The guilty person should be executed, but instead he had to make a public procession holding a dog in his hands.⁹⁵ Some German scholars, like Dümmler and Köpke, were puzzled by this peculiar punishment.⁹⁶

From the tone of the text it seems that this is a very harsh punishment. But it does not end the conflict. For Althoff it was actually the spark that pushed it into full blown war. Otto's action was a humiliation of Eberhard's men and the whole judgement was targeted at the *Dux* to show him his place in the kingdom.⁹⁷ This was challenged by Bachrach, who in Eberhard's

92 Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 71; Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 79; Zotz, 'Amicitia'.

93 For the conflict, see: Zotz, 'Amicitia', p. 173-75.

94 Widukind II.6.

95 'The punishment was a traditional one intended to dishonour the culprit', Bagge, *Kings*, p. 43, note 77; Schwenk, 'Das Hundetragen', p. 297; Innes, *State*, p. 234. The submission part of the ritual should lead to reconciliation (Dalewski, *Ritual*, p. 52). While this type of punishment could also be interpreted as merciful, it was still dishonourable; Garnier, *Die Kultur*, p. 54-55. For this and similar punishment of bearing saddle, see Hemming, 'Sellam gestare', especially p. 49-53, 57.

96 Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 63.

97 Althoff, *Family*, p. 125 note 67.

actions saw an attempt to extend his power over the King's retainers, which would mean that Otto's reaction was appropriate.⁹⁸

While conflict has not yet turned into a full blown war, Otto orders a meeting in Steele, where a judicial duel takes place. The winner is Bruning's side, but because of many claims of injustice from Eberhard and his people, the judgement is postponed, which leads to a great misery. Both Eberhard and Thankmar, united in their feelings of injustice, rebel and at Belecka they capture Henry.⁹⁹ Thankmar is soon killed, while Eberhard reconciles with the King and after a brief exile is returned to his posts and honours.¹⁰⁰

In Liudprand's version, the rebellion begins with Henry being captured. This is the first act of Eberhard's aggression. Henry is incautious and stays in a city, besieged by Eberhard's army and is soon captured along with great loot. It is done so swiftly, that Otto is unable to come to the aid of his brother. The capture is one of the reasons why the King fights with Eberhard, in revenge for his brother.¹⁰¹ Here Otto is a defender of his dynasty, who wants to guarantee the safety of his family.

Adalbert presented a different description of the early days of the conflict. In 937 a fight between Henry and Eberhard begins, caused by their vassals' actions, which reminds of the Bruning affair. In the next year's entry, the rebellion has spread and now Arnulf sons, led by one named Eberhard, take arms against the King. At the same time Henry is captured by the Franconian Eberhard in Belecka, but soon released. The capturer was then sent into exile to Hildesheim. By the next year he has returned and together with Gisbert and Henry begins to fight against the King.¹⁰²

Eberhard acts differently in some respect in Liudprand and Widukind's texts. In the former, the actions of the Franconian *dux* are clear and he remains consistent in his acts. He is a rebel from the beginning to the end. Widukind's Eberhard changes his mind. First he rebels with Thankmar, but after Thankmar's death and the desertion of troops from his cause, he begins to doubt his actions. He then falls on the ground in front of one of his captives – it seems this is Henry – and begs for mercy.¹⁰³ It is later revealed that this was only a ploy, or that his feeling of remorse was directed only at Henry.¹⁰⁴

98 Bachrach, *Warfare*, p. 41.

99 Widukind II.10-11.

100 Widukind II.13.

101 *Antapodosis* IV.20.

102 Regino of Prüm ad 937-39.

103 Widukind II.11.

104 Cf. Widukind II.12.

Frutolf's account is a fine example of his way of constructing a narrative. He used both Liudprand and Widukind to create a coherent narration. The fights brake off in the same way as in *Res Gestae*, with the death of Siegfried of Merseburg and Thankmar being passed over, and combined with Eberhard's conflict with the 'noble man' Bruning.¹⁰⁵ Frutolf does not mention that Bruning was Eberhard's vassal and his text highlights that Widukind's narrative is open to different interpretations. The punishment for Eberhard's attack on the city Elmeri and the story about Henry's capture in Belecka were also repeated in an unchanged form.¹⁰⁶ Later on, when Frutolf notes that Eberhard was able to make Giselbert join the rebel cause, he used Liudprand's text. He follows it with one big and some minor changes. He excluded the information about how Eberhard and Giselbert convinced Henry to join them. This is not a mistake but an author's decision. In the following description of Otto's army he withholds the information about Henry collecting troops against his brother. The reason for this is that Frutolf shortened *Antapodosis* and made its narrative plain. He placed Henry's treason further on in his text, in its proper place he copied from Liudprand's account that Otto's younger brother joined his enemies because of the promise of the crown which all rebels wished to acquire.¹⁰⁷ Frutolf ends his description of the reasons for the rebellion by placing the emphasis on the rebels' ambitions and desire for power.

For Liudprand, the proof of who was right and who was wrong in the conflict is its outcome. Not only did Giselbert and Eberhard die, but Henry is also not left without a scratch. The Battle of Birten is definite proof of his wrongdoings: he is struck with such power that his hand becomes numb and gave him great pain for the following year.¹⁰⁸ Henry's death, even if it happened 'long after the occasion of his crime' was because of this wound.¹⁰⁹ Previously Liudprand had noted that because of his death 'we spilled a lot of tears'.¹¹⁰ This is not a contradiction. In one place in the text Henry is a sadly missed person, while in another it is more fitting to blame him for the rebellion.

The wound to a hand had some importance. Frutolf, when writing about Rudolf of Rheinfelden's rebellion against Henry IV, described his last moments. Rudolf is wounded in the Battle of Hohenmölsen in 1080 and while

¹⁰⁵ 'Primoribus', Frutolf, *Chronicon*, p. 184.

¹⁰⁶ Frutolf, *Chronicon*, p. 184; Widukind II.6, 10, 11.

¹⁰⁷ Frutolf, *Chronicon*, p. 185; *Antapodosis* IV.21-23

¹⁰⁸ *Antapodosis* IV.24.

¹⁰⁹ 'Multo post huius facinporis occasione', *Antapodosis* IV.24; Squatriti, p. 157.

¹¹⁰ 'Non mediocres adhuc lacrimas fundimus', *Antapodosis* IV.15; Squatriti, p. 151.

dying, points at his lost right hand and remarks that it was the hand with which he swore fidelity to the King.¹¹¹ A similar thing happens to a certain Conrad, who according to Thietmar claimed he had a secret relationship with Liutgard, Otto I's daughter. After she professed her innocence to her father, he gathered all the *duces* of the kingdom and asked if someone would defend her honour. Upon this Count Burchard stood up and as Conrad made an oath, the duel proceeded, in which Conrad lost his 'false right hand'.¹¹² While it can be argued that these punishments were only result of breaking the oath, there is also another story by Thietmar that is relevant here. It takes place at Henry I's palace when a dog recognised an enemy and managed to bite off the man's right hand. The man then revealed that a long time ago he killed the master of this dog while he was sleeping.¹¹³ Therefore the dog was the bringer of justice. The loss of right hand marked wrongdoing.

We also need to add to the overall negative image of rebels in *Antapodosis*. After the battle of Birten Eberhard gathered soldiers to Breisach in Alsace, from where he embarked on a campaign of terror against the people of nearby lands and those who were members of the king's court.¹¹⁴ This information is reminiscent of Hrotsvit's Otto, who, when hearing about the many casualties and the innocents who victims of the war, is in a great sadness. He even prays to God to protect the people who are in dire situation because of the war. Only he, a king, should have to endure the strain and the devastating effects of the conflict.¹¹⁵

The description of Breisach in Frutolf's chronicle is taken straight from Liudprand's work interpolated with specific information about the name of Breisach, and how the place is called Brisahcgowe by everyone neighbouring it, because the Harlungen were from there.¹¹⁶

Ekkehard IV provides a very different version of how Giselbert and Eberhard joined the war. For him the one responsible for this was the *Dux* of Lotharingia, who prompted Conrad's brother to act because he gave up the crown for Henry. The author clearly thought that the rebellion took

111 Frutolf, *Chronicon*, p. 204; cf. Frutolf and Eccardus, *Chronicles*, p. 37-38.

112 'Dexteram mendacem', Thietmar, *Chronik* II.39; Warner, p. 120. The duel was also referred to by Adalbert, Regino of Prüm ad 950.

113 Thietmar, *Chronik*, I.17.

114 For Breisach, see Maurer, *Der Herzog*, p. 75-82; cf. Zotz, 'Est in Alsacie'.

115 Hrotsvit, *Gesta Ottonis*, line 262-75.

116 Frutolf, *Chronicon*, p. 185, line 47-48. The Harlungens were the children of Diether (Theoderic the Great), lord of Breisach, killed by his brother according to the late thirteenth century, see *Dietrichs Flucht*, line 2568-74 and p. 306, cf. Lienert, *Die <historische> Dietrichepik*, p. 194-95.

place under Henry I's reign. The rebellion in this account is quite short, as it ends soon after Gisbert and Eberhard were killed.¹¹⁷

Leyser argued that while each rebel had hopes for a crown, the conflict was a combination of struggles within families and an attempt by the Franconians, Lotharingians, and Bavarians to take up the reign of the kingdom.¹¹⁸ This view was followed more recently by Hermann Kamp who emphasised that the genesis of the civil war was Henry I's decision not to divide the kingdom between his sons. This, and the lack of any compensation in inheritance for other members of the ruling family was behind the conflicts, where castles and cities given to Henry by his father were the first victims of the war.¹¹⁹

The descriptions of the rebels' cruelty towards innocent people captivated some scholars. In Dümmler and Köpke's book these activities are marked as extremely wrong. Attacks were targeted at lands owned by Conrad the Wise and Udo, with the possible plan of capturing the King himself.¹²⁰

Parallel division inside families of the kingdom was noted. Both the Liudolfings and the Conradines were fighting each other.¹²¹ This element was especially emphasised in *Antapodosis*. Exactly the same view was presented by Dümmler and Köpke. They wrote that the civil war was not waged on behalf of the lands or the people, but was a family conflict. These fights tore apart the kingdom, and only Otto was the defender of unity.¹²² Still, they adapted their account of the causes of the war from Widukind. The King's actions pushed Eberhard to become disgruntled with his rule, not because he was punished, but because the King did not take any actions against Bruning. Therefore, Eberhard could feel resentment against his ruling. At first, Thankmar's reasons for rebellion also seemed justified. After Siegfried's death, he hoped to inherit his wealth and the title of count, but instead it went to Gero. Dümmler and Köpke argued that later events showed that Gero was the best man for the post, and thus the King's decision was correct.¹²³

Their narrative about the reasons for the civil war is short and concise. Information on the conflicts in Bavaria after the death of Arnulf is followed

117 Ekkehard IV, *Casus Sancti Galli*, c. 50.

118 Leyser, *Rule*, p. 17, 21; Giese wrote that the rebellion was Franks' reaction against the Saxons (p. 116-70) coming from their inability to accept that they were no longer the 'people of the king' ('Königsvolk'); Giese, *Der Stamm*, p. 124.

119 Kamp, 'Konflikte', p. 169-70.

120 Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 91.

121 Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 72-73.

122 Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 98; cf. Schmid, 'Die Thronfolge', p. 500-01.

123 Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 63, 69, 71.

with the statement that in this way there was conflict and disturbance in all the pillars of the Reich.¹²⁴ They note the penalty of 100 talents and there is a reference to Grimm's information on the punishment with the dogs.¹²⁵ They used *Res Gestae*, but at the same time they took a lot of their information from Liudprand's narrative. The note about the young Henry's double crossing is a good example. Dümmler and Köpke point to *Antapodosis* as the source of their information about Eberhard's plans to overthrow Henry after defeating Otto and to take the crown for himself. In a footnote they add that this was based on a 'folk tale'.¹²⁶ The overall narrative follows the general outlook of the two main chronicles with some additional information taken from the other sources. One important difference is that for Dümmler and Köpke Louis d'Outremer took part in the conflict to regain Lotharingia. They made many notes about how this was a part of a much larger strategy that did not work out.¹²⁷ Throughout their text they place great emphasis on the importance of Lotharingia during the war.

Neither Liudprand nor Widukind mention Louis' participation in war, while Adalbert noted that he invaded Alsace after being instigated by rebels. He did so in the hope of re-conquering Lotharingia, but was forced out from there by the King.¹²⁸ Liudprand is known for ignoring the Carolingians, but it is difficult to explain Widukind's reasons.

For Dümmler and Köpke the civil war is in some way reminiscent of the situation of Germany in the second part of the nineteenth century. Here is a king who stands for the unity, just like William I, the first *Kaiser* of the Second Reich. The probable reason for the important role of Louis in their narrative also lies in that modern conflict. It created an immediate connection between the past and present.

The same view of the French connection is present in Cartellieri's book. Cartellieri constructed some sort of parallel lives for Otto and Louis. Both kings are compared and it was clear that for him the actions of Germany's western neighbours were very important. Thus, Widukind's account of Thankmar and Eberhard's rebellion was marginalised. It is actually quite difficult in Cartellieri's account to explain why it began, as Henry is made a pretender to the throne, but the basis of his claim is not explained. Even Eberhard's actions, his final rebellion, were moved and placed after

124 Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 71.

125 Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 63 note 4-5.

126 'Volkssage', Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p.76, note 3.

127 Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p.86-88, 94.

128 Regino of Prüm ad 939.

Birten in the chronology, thus creating the impression that he was acting according to the movement of Louis' army. As for Giselbert, he either wanted to be a King of Germany, or if this was impossible, become a King of Lotharingia.¹²⁹

The notion that Otto acted with the good of his kingdom in his mind was also accepted by Holtzmann in *Geschichte*....¹³⁰ For example, Thankmar is described as an aggressive, bellicose man happy to go to war. Otto's decision of not giving him Siegfried's inheritance showed that he was thinking about the Reich as a whole and his actions were meant to strengthen it. He was not interested in his, or his family's gain.¹³¹ As for Eberhard's action against Bruning, Holtzmann accepted it as an action carried out according to the old Germanic law (a right to raid the enemy), but Otto represented the new stronger Germany.¹³² What Eberhard did was a major breach of the peace and he was rightfully punished.¹³³

Holtzmann also had such rational views about Giselbert's reasons for his rebellion. His aim was to return to the traditional Lotharingian politics, where the *dux* was independent from both the Eastern and Western kingdoms. Giselbert was to ally with the internal enemies of the western king and at the same time with the rebels against Otto. While the emphasis was placed on Giselbert's activities, it is clear that France was also seen as an enemy, especially as this *Dux* and the duchy's nobles made homage to Louis.¹³⁴ There is a change in attitude between Dümmler and Köpke's time and when Holtzmann was writing. In his much shorter account the latter author placed much more stress on Giselbert's treachery than on the activities of the western neighbour.

Here Hermann, Udo, and Conrad were at first on Eberhard's side, but when one Gebhard from the Conradine family fell during the attack on Belecke, they came to believe that this was God's decision and then returned to the King.¹³⁵ Gebhard's death and the following events were also noted

129 Cartellieri, *Die Weltstellung*, p. 54, 57-59.

130 Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 125.

131 Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 117.

132 While correct in old Germanic law, it was contrary to the established Carolingian system of resolving conflicts. Charlemagne was vehemently opposed to feuds between nobles. What Eberhard did could be called a *Werra*, a private war, which could never be seen as a just; Nelson, 'The Search for Peace', p. 88-91.

Giese wrote that Otto had a basis for his action and as Eberhard, he had the right to act how he did; Giese, *Der Stamm*, p. 115-16.

133 Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 118.

134 Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 122-23.

135 Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 120.

by Dümmler and Köpke.¹³⁶ This information is based on the very vague information from Widukind that this death divided the Conradines.¹³⁷

Quite similar to the text of *Geschichte...* is the narrative of Holtzmann's earlier biography. Otto punished Eberhard's arrogant attack on Bruning, which angered the Franconian *dux* and pushed him to become rebel. When Thankmar was mentioned, it was highlighted that according to the Church he was an illegitimate child. This was connected with the same criticism of Eberhard's action as noted above, here called as being against the old Germanic law, and with Otto's recovery of rights over the Church from the Bavarian *dux*. Before anyone could see this last act as a pro-Church policy, Holtzmann stated that this was done for the greater good of the Reich, and not for the Church. He also made the same point about Giselbert wanting to acquire independence from both kingdoms, Western and Eastern, and about the importance of the fights against Louis and his plans to acquire Lotharingia.¹³⁸

While in his later work Holtzmann tried to create a more nuanced vision of Otto's reign, here he used more concrete arguments to fend off criticism of the king. Therefore, Holtzmann depicts Otto's actions as praiseworthy and at the same time presents the rebels as clearly in the wrong, who did everything for personal reasons.¹³⁹

The clear defence of Otto's actions precedes the rebellion in Günter's book. When Eberhard attacked Bruning, Otto fined him wishing to make peace between them. This proved impossible as the *Dux* could not forget about the punishment. He was motivated by his need for revenge.¹⁴⁰ Günter placed the blame for the civil war not on the King, but on Eberhard. The same view was expressed about Thankmar's reasons for opposing the ruler. After Siegfried's death, Otto chose not any man, but one of his 'comrades in arms'.¹⁴¹ Gero was presented as a good pick considering the kingdom's situation. Still, Günter was not surprised that Thankmar later on opposed Otto. His account of Henry's reasons for joining the rebellion was based on Widukind's account.¹⁴² Interestingly, Günter never mentioned that Eberhard and Giselbert might have wanted to be king, as claimed by Liudprand. Louis's involvement in the civil war was also downplayed.¹⁴³

¹³⁶ Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 71-72.

¹³⁷ Widukind II.11.

¹³⁸ Holtzmann, *Kaiser*, p. 30-31, 33-34.

¹³⁹ Cf. Holtzmann, *Kaiser*, p. 31.

¹⁴⁰ Günter, *Kaiser*, p. 39.

¹⁴¹ 'Waffengefährten', Günter, *Kaiser*, p. 39.

¹⁴² Günter, *Kaiser*, p. 40.

¹⁴³ Günter, *Kaiser*, p. 45.

Althoff sets the story in a quite different context. While initially he noted Liudprand's reasons for the conflict – Henry's ambition and Gisbert and Eberhard's desire for the crown – he completely disregarded them. He accounted for them as gossip and slanderous tales created at the king's court as attacks on his enemies. The narratives about the beginning of the conflict and Liudprand's account of it show how the court wanted to see the rebellion; *Antapodosis* is in a way a collection of *exempla*. Thankfully for the historians, in Althoff's view, there is Widukind with usable information which can explain the conflict. This is because Widukind wrote about the king's rulings that preceded the outburst of fighting. When Althoff quoted his story about Bruning, he concluded that Otto's judgement was offensive to Eberhard and that it was controversial, because it meant he had influence over his vassal's vassal. Even Thankmar was presented in a more positive way.¹⁴⁴

While Althoff acknowledged that Otto's actions were intended to strengthen the kingdom and his rule, he nevertheless called them an insult to Eberhard and Thankmar. That Otto acted in this way toward Henry I's friends was especially important.¹⁴⁵ Althoff also downplayed Louis' role in the rebellion. He argued only that Gisbert at one time changed the allegiance of his duchy to West Frankish during the civil war. This is seen as part of the general description of the conflicts between Otto and Louis. For Althoff, Germany's western neighbour had no major role in the civil war.¹⁴⁶ There are parts of the text that show his disdain for *Antapodosis*. For example, when writing about Eberhard, Althoff expresses the opinion that both Widukind and Liudprand wrote that he made peace with the King after his first attack and before joining hands with Henry.¹⁴⁷ Instead Liudprand wrote about the whole rebellion as one long struggle. There is no Eberhard's submission, so Liudprand could not write what Althoff stated he did. This and other similar statements show that for him *Antapodosis* was not as important as Widukind's chronicle.¹⁴⁸ In his latest textbook, the conflict was connected to Otto's claims for power, which were against the already strong vision of the nobles' position in kingdom. This is seen in Widukind's ritual of coronation¹⁴⁹ and later expanded in the description

144 Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 77-80.

145 Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 81.

146 Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 88-89.

147 Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 82-83.

148 Other example is when he notes how Gisbert says to his wife that now she holds a *dux*, but that soon it will be a king. In reality Liudprand wrote that about Eberhard; Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 78. He did not make this mistake elsewhere; Althoff, 'Geschichtsschreibung', p. 162.

149 Althoff and Keller, *Die Zeit*, p. 157; cf. Schmid, 'Die Thronfolge', p. 498.

of the judgement in the conflict between Bruning and Eberhard, where it is described as a problem arising from Otto intervention in the relations between a *dux* and his vassal.¹⁵⁰

When the conflict finally erupted, Althoff observed that not all Eberhard's relatives joined him in the fight, but this is not connected to the division in the ruling house. It is only later in the text that Henry joins the rebels after being promised the crown by Eberhard. Here Althoff treated the idea that other rebels wanted to reign as unreliable. At the same time there is an elaborate description of Louis' plans for acquiring Lotharingia.¹⁵¹

It seems that Laudage's view is dominant: it was Otto's style of rule and the refusal of any compromise which led to the conflict. His interpretation of the reasons of rebellion was far from being original and he began it with an account of the contest between Eberhard and Bruning, followed by Thankmar's craving for his inheritance after Siegfried dies and finally the introduction of Henry into the picture. Overall Laudage followed Widukind's narrative and saw Liudprand's account as based on court tales, as he never mentioned the meeting at Saalfeld.¹⁵² He also notes the change of the style of rule as a possible motive for Henry's actions. He also wrote more about Eberhard's conflict with Bruning and Thankmar's hope for inheritance, where the latter's actions fit the pattern of inner dynastic conflicts.¹⁵³

This reflection is followed with an account of the reasons for Henry's rebellion, which only Liudprand wrote more about, but he was not only the 'most talkative but at the same time not the most reliable of contemporary authors'.¹⁵⁴ Here the part of *Antapodosis* where Liudprand describes how perverse people tried to influence Henry is quoted. Laudage attributes the speech in the text to Eberhard. The overall construction of this part of his book is interesting. Laudage lists various reasons for the rebellion and the aim of this is to show that there was not one direct cause for it. In this way he strongly downplayed the role of the Aachen coronation. It was not that the change of the way the King governed his kingdom was a sole cause for the later conflict. It was only one among many causes of the civil war, some of them well known in Carolingian times.¹⁵⁵ Still, it was the most important one.

150 Althoff and Keller, *Die Zeit*, p. 159.

151 Althoff and Keller, *Die Zeit*, p. 160-63; 164-65.

152 Laudage, *Otto*, p. 111-16; for more about the *convivium* at Saalefeld, see Althoff, 'Zur Frage', p. 135-36.

153 Laudage, *Otto*, p. 120-24.

154 'Der geschwätzigste, aber nicht unbedingt glaubwürdigste unter den zeitgenössischen Autoren', Laudage, *Otto*, p. 125.

155 Laudage, *Otto*, p. 124-26.

All of these authors, while they often had disparaging words about Liudprand's work, rarely took a closer look at the precise ideas behind his explanation of the beginning of the rebellion. At the same time Widukind is set up as trustworthy without any inquiry into the reliability of his version. Instead, the questions were limited to merely understanding the narrative.

5 Beginning of the Civil War in 937

Having said this, the next stage is the Civil War itself. Immediately after explaining the reasons for Eberhard's actions, Liudprand begins his description of the central point of the rebellion. In *Antapodosis* only the battle of Birten is given a longer description.¹⁵⁶ The rest of the conflict is presented through smaller vignettes. The narrative is quite long, so I will present the outline here and only then go into the details. First the rebels gather troops while Otto, in contrast, places his faith in God. When both armies finally meet, they are divided by the Rhine and only a few of the king's soldiers have crossed it beforehand. This small group wage battle while the rest only witness the fighting. Nevertheless, they defeat Henry's troops and Otto's brother is wounded. Meanwhile, the King prays, kneeling on the ground, and holding the Holy Lance in his hands. Liudprand gives an account of how this Lance, which is instrumental in the victory, came to Saxony, followed by a narrative about the doubts of the Apostle Thomas at the resurrection of Christ; this is used by Liudprand to show that the victory happened thanks to God's providence.¹⁵⁷ The narrative is interrupted by a description of how a certain nobleman wanted to acquire the Lorsch monastery for his compliance with Otto, but his plea is refused. Finally, at the battle of Andernach between the rebels and Udo, Hermann, and Conrad, those who opposed the King are defeated. Eberhard dies in battle and Gisbert drowns in the Rhine. Hearing this, Otto prays in thanks to God. The rest of the book is dominated by the description of the pacification of the kingdom.¹⁵⁸ The guilty are judged with the mercy worthy of a king.

Liudprand placed the victory in the higher plane of God's plan. Otto acts throughout the narrative more like a religious figure than a warrior. He does not fight his enemies by the means of a sword, but by prayer. He

¹⁵⁶ On the place of battle, see Runde, *Xanten*, p. 320-22. W. Soldan connected the place with wars of the French revolution and even Julius Caesar; Soldan, 'Wo find Eberhard', p. 3-4, 9.

¹⁵⁷ *Antapodosis* IV.24-26.

¹⁵⁸ *Antapodosis* IV.28-35.

is not a weakling, like Berengar I, who did not participate in battle against the Hungarians, as Otto's piety has a vital role in the victories.¹⁵⁹

6 Battle of Birten¹⁶⁰

The battle of Birten is one of the most famous of Liudprand's descriptions. In it he shows that Otto was an exceptional ruler and possessed the grace of God. The battle took place after Henry, together with Giselbert and Eberhard, gathered his forces against the King. It is all in accordance to Liudprand's statements that the latter two felt that both of them were way too weak to stand against Otto, so they needed assistance. Together the three were more powerful. Therefore, they placed their hopes and faith in a strong army and a large number of soldiers. Otto, believing that God decides who would be victorious, rushed against his enemy, unafraid of the smaller size of his army. His belief that piety was the most important element in a war is proven by a quotation from Psalm 32 (33): '[S]hall not be saved by the abundance of his strength'.¹⁶¹ This Psalm is concerned with the omnipotence of God and his mercy. The King shall not win thanks to armies, but through prayer and faithfulness. Augustine explained that it is to God's mercy that a man should look for help.¹⁶²

The small size of the army of good cause is mentioned in many narratives. It highlights the valour of the fighting men. Nithard described the struggle between Charles the Bald and Lothar. The formers' army is much weaker and lost troops each day. Charles' men choose to 'die nobly rather than betray and abandon their king'.¹⁶³ While Lothar's army is stronger, he is unable to win and is forced to make a truce. Similarly, in Paul the Deacon's *Historia Longobardorum*, during the war between Cunincpert and Alahis, the former, who is a positive character, has a smaller army than his enemy.¹⁶⁴

¹⁵⁹ *Antapodosis* II.10; for this, the first Hungarian attack on Italy, see Krahwinkler, *Friaul*, p. 284-85; Fasoli, *Ire*, p. 58-59.

¹⁶⁰ For the author of the popular *Bildersaal*... the rebellion and Henry's later submission was the most important occurrence of Otto's reign, while Lechfeld is ignored; Bär and Quensel, *Bildersaal*, p. 52 (picture), 54 (text). Also, Friedrich Castelle in 1931 directed a play *1000 Jahre Schlacht bei Birten* in the Amphitheater Birten bei Xanten; Trost, *Eine gänzlich*, p. 43 note 66.

¹⁶¹ 'In abundantia autem virtutis suae non salvabitur', Psalm 32 (33).17; *Antapodosis* IV.24; Squatriti, p. 156. For Psalms and war in the times of the Carolingians see Smith, *War*, p. 9-28.

¹⁶² Augustine of Hippo, *Enarrationes*, 32 enarratio I.

¹⁶³ 'Potius nobiliter mori quam regem proditum derelinquere', *Nithardi Historiarum libri IIII*, II.4; Scholz and Rogers, p. 144.

¹⁶⁴ Paul the Deacon, *Historia gentis Langobardorum*, V.39-41.

In William of Poitiers' account of the conquest, William the Conqueror is an even better exemplar of such behaviour. When preparing to cross the channel, many bad things happen. He loses ships, he is deserted by troops, but nevertheless he remains constant in his faith in God and the belief that he shall be protected and helped. Thanks to this, and a special mass and aid from the relics of Saint Valery, the winds become favourable.¹⁶⁵ Also, Henry III in the battle of Menfö against the Hungarians had a distinctively smaller army. Nevertheless, he crossed the river Raabe and defeated his opponents. In *Annales Altahenses maiores* this is seen as possible thanks to God and his rightful judgement.¹⁶⁶ In some sources the example of Judah Maccabee is used as an example of leading troops against larger armies, because of his confidence in God's help.¹⁶⁷ Also in legends Charlemagne never refuses to battle God's enemies.¹⁶⁸ It is almost as if the good king had to go in to battle, no matter the odds. The early Irish hero Cuchulain was a man who would stop at nothing where his honour was concerned. If a much stronger army stood against him, he would still fight, no matter how big it was.¹⁶⁹

This also again brings up the particular idea Liudprand addresses throughout the chronicle. It has been observed above and will be later that he argued that people's actions are less important than God's will. Before describing the battle of Birten he instructs his readers to 'listen to the ancient miracle renewed by the Lord'.¹⁷⁰ It is clear that Liudprand evoked Battle in Rephidim. The Israelites were quite aggressive towards Moses before it, because there was nothing to drink and they were thirsty. The Almighty then told Moses to take the staff with which he struck the Nile and ordered him to strike a certain rock from which water then started to flow. Almost immediately afterwards the Israelites were attacked by the nomadic Amalekites. Moses ordered Joshua to pick a group of soldiers and fight, while he, together with

165 William of Poitiers, *Gesta Guillelmi*, II.6, cf. Bachrach, *Religion*, p. 83-84; Rollo also prayed to God for good winds when he sailed with his army, see Dudo of St. Quentin, *De moribus*, c. 8.

166 *Annales Altahenses maiores* ad 1044; cf. Anufrieva, 'Молитва', p. 3 note 6.

167 It is best seen in 2 Macc. 8.18, where Judah says that while their enemies put faith in their weapons, the Israelites put it in God. See here also *Carmen in victoriam Pisanorum* 27; cf. Bachrach, *Religion*, p. 89-90; on the text and its background see Cowdrey, 'The Mahdia'; Bachrach, 'Conforming', p. 3-5. Cf. Caesar of Heisterbach, *Dialogus*, VIII.66.

168 From *prefatio in epistola tulpini archiepiscopi*, published in Rauschen, *Die Legende Karls*, p. 67; see also: Smyser, ed., *The Pseudo-Turpin*, p. 55; cf. Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers*, p. 172. For Pseudo-Turpin see among many: Brown, 'Saint-Denis', p. 51-71; Pysiak, *Król*, p. 82-84.

For more examples of how a small army could defeat a larger enemy, see Żmudzki, *Władca*, p. 334-36, 353-62.

169 *The Ancient Irish Epic Tale Táin Bó Cúailnge*, p. 42-43.

170 'Audi antiquum a Domino renovatum miraculum', *Antapodosis* IV.24; Squatriti, p. 156.

Aaron and Chur, went to a hill with the staff in his hand. There Moses prayed to God, and thanks to this the Israelites were victorious. This is attested by how when Moses became weaker and could not hold up his hands to pray, the Israelites started to lose the fight, but after he returned to the proper posture, they immediately regained their vigour.¹⁷¹

The ancient miracle was renewed in the way Birten was won. Otto's soldiers cross the river on the ships, as the Rhine is otherwise too wide at that point. None of them is aware that the rebels are at that time very close and are surprised when their whole army arrives. Until that time, only a small fraction of Otto's troops has crossed the river. Not only is his army was smaller, but only part of it fought in the battle.¹⁷²

When the soldiers become aware that they have no hope of reinforcement and no way of escape they decide to fight.¹⁷³ The impossibility of flight is not a disadvantage for them, as they believe that it does not befit them. For the same reason they will not surrender to the enemy. Liudprand uses a similar construction in a description of the battle between the Hungarians and Italians which will be discussed in the following chapter. Both the Saxons and Hungarians are reminded that they have no means of escape and are therefore in the position where fight is the only option. While there is no proper speech before the battle of Birten, the soldier's discussion resembles it.¹⁷⁴ They state clearly that they were on the side of 'truth and justice'.¹⁷⁵ They encourage themselves by reminding each other that they will achieve eternal life by fighting, which fits the construction of the battle speech.¹⁷⁶

Otto sees his soldiers' actions as having God's providence supporting them. Therefore, when he is reminded about the Battle in Rephidim, he gets off his horse and with all his army he prays to God crying and holding the Holy Lance in front of him. Here Liudprand uses another biblical

171 Ex. 17.1-13; cf. Kang, *Divine War*, p. 125-27; see also Van Seters, *The Life of Moses*, p. 204-06; Reid, *Moses's Staff*, p. 42-43, 69. Cf. Graus, *Volk*, p. 460-61.

Moses appeared in the *ordo* from Sankt Emmeram's early ninth century manuscript (now Clm 14510, fol. 72v-74r) in a prayer known as *Deus, qui victrices Moysi* as the one, by whose hands God defeated the Amalekites and in the French *Ordo* made for Charles V and for Charles VIII; Jackson, ed., *Ordines coronationis*, 1 (Philadelphia, 1995), p. 66-68; cf. *Ordines coronationis Franciae*, 2, p. 505-06. It appears also in *Ordo* of Burgundy; Bouman, *Sacring and Crowning*, p. 7-8, 22, 93 note 1, 114-17, 158-59.

The prayer was also edited by Waitz as *Benedictio regalis*.

172 *Antapodosis* IV.24.

173 *Antapodosis* IV.24.

174 Bliese, 'Rhetoric', p. 209.

175 'Veritatis [...] ac iustitiae', *Antapodosis* IV.24; Squatriti, p. 156; cf. Bliese, 'Rhetoric', p. 206.

176 Bliese, 'Rhetoric', p. 215.

reference, as he reminds his readers of Saint James' instruction that the prayer of a righteous man provides tremendous effects.¹⁷⁷ Consequently, on the king's side there are no casualties, while the enemy is completely crushed. Liudprand emphasises the disparity in numbers between the armies further, writing that only a few rebels saw any of Otto's men, as there were so few of them.¹⁷⁸ Therefore, by making the victory into something achieved by prayer Liudprand shows that Otto is an exceptionally righteous man. The great victory means that a highly righteous man was praying. In this, Körntgen saw the idea that Otto, through his actions, became Moses and the whole battle is given many references to the Old Testament.¹⁷⁹ Althoff viewed Otto's action as a spectacle where he both imitated and in a way quoted the Bible.¹⁸⁰

The Holy Lance needs to be seen in its proper context. Liudprand asserted that this was a weapon from God, a sort of religious weapon of mass destruction.¹⁸¹ Using relics in a battle is a popular motif. In Gregory of Tours' *History of Franks*, a King from the East has a finger of the martyr Sergius joined with his right hand. When he is attacked, he only had to raise it and his enemies flee.¹⁸² Another such relic was a cape of Saint Martin in Notker's *Gesta Karoli Magni*.¹⁸³ The victories achieved thanks to relics should be seen as their miracles, not as a help from the saint.¹⁸⁴ According to one eleventh century copy of *Annales Laurissenses*, Charlemagne achieved many of his victories thanks to the relics of Innocent, which he had at battlefield.¹⁸⁵ In one of these legends, in one battle he used a reliquary called 'fighter' in which there was a part of the True Cross.¹⁸⁶

177 James 5.16.

178 *Antapodosis* IV.24.

179 Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft*, p. 55-56. Cf. Schreiner, 'Signa victricia', p. 46-47.

180 Althoff, 'The Variability', p. 84-85. For the connection between prayer, liturgy and war, see McCormick, 'The Liturgy'. A good example of a prayer before battle can be found in Venantius Fortunatus, *Liber de virtutibus sancti Hilarii*, c. 20-21; cf. Van Dam, *Saints*, p. 22. Anufrieva saw it as an example of a ritual, see Anufrieva, 'Молитва', p. 3.

181 *Antapodosis* IV.25. The True Cross was such symbol in Byzantium and the Ottonians had the Lance; Schweineköper, 'Christus-Reliquien-Verehrung', p. 208-09.

182 Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum*, VII.31. Cf. Lucius, *Die Anfänge*, p. 237-38.

183 Notkerus Balbulus, *Gesta Karoli Magni*, I.4; Bachrach, *Early Carolingian*, p. 150; cf. Walafrid Strabo, *Libellus de exordiis*, c. 32. Schreiner, 'Signa victricia', p. 44-45; Bougard, 'La relique', p. 43; Ewig, 'Le culte', p. 16-17. On *cappa* see Van Dam, *Saints*, p. 26-27.

184 Graus, *Volk*, p. 461.

185 *Annales Regni Francorum* 769; cf. Remensnyder, *Remembering*, p. 165.

186 'Bellator', Monsabert, *Chartes et documents*, p. 30; cf. Remensnyder, *Remembering*, p. 171-72; Bozóky, *La politique*, p. 196-98, cf. Gabriele, *An Empire*, p. 44-51; Pysiak, *Król*, p. 44; on the reliquary

William of Poitiers' William the Conqueror had relics with him at Hastings. They were to remind him that Harold Godwinson broke his oath about the future of the English crown. The chronicler wanted to present the war as a just one.¹⁸⁷ By wearing the relics around his neck, William showed that he was right when he crossed the channel.¹⁸⁸ Relics were taken to war also in Byzantium, sometimes in the form of a special cross, containing more than one.¹⁸⁹

Caesarius of Heisterbach's tale about the siege of Alcazar is relevant here, as the crusaders constantly claimed help from God. They call upon the saints James and Vincent and many others during the battle. The captured Saracens assert that they were put to flight by the vision of the cross. The main point here is that after the story there is a dialogue where a Novice asks a Monk: 'Is there any sin in going to satisfy the needs of nature with the relics of martyrs'.¹⁹⁰ For which the answer is that clearly it is not a sin for the righteous.

The relics and other material symbols of God's providence strengthened the view of justice. Similarly to Widukind's description of the Battle of Lechfeld, where holding the Lance is way of acquiring God's help, the Lance in Liudprand's tale is a sign of who was right.¹⁹¹ The way Otto reacted is as important as the Lance. His prayer is in no way outstanding – it is something to be expected. There are numerous examples of prayers before the battle. One of them is a prayer written by Bishop Baturich of Regensburg for Louis the German known as *Benedictio Crucis*.¹⁹² It was meant to be said before a battle. The army was to be set in front of the banner with a cross held by

which was probably for the True Cross see Remensnyder, 'Legendary Treasure', p. 896-97; on Charroux, see Gabriele, *An Empire*, p. 44-51.

187 William of Poitiers, *Gesta Guillelmi*, II.15; Rubenstein, 'William of Poitiers', p. 13132, 137-38; Bachrach, *Religion*, p. 91 note 145; Ghosh, *Kings*, p. 120 note 39.

188 Bachrach, *Religion*, p. 91.

189 Haldon, *Warfare*, p. 22; Stouraitis, "Just War", p. 236-37.

190 'Estne peccatum cum martyrum reliquiis ire ad requisita naturae?', Caesar of Heisterbach, *Dialogus*, VIII.66; Scott and Swinton Bland, 2, p. 69; Graus, *Volk*, p. 456-57.

191 Bachrach, *Religion*, p. 90-92. Compare this with the *Legenda Christiani*, where during the war against prince of Kouřim (called Radoslav in *Staročeská kronika tak řečeného Dalimila*, c. 30), Saint Wenceslaus fights a duel when its outcome could not be decided in a battle. God makes the Holy Cross appear over/on the head of Wenceslaus and on seeing it, his enemy surrenders; *Legenda Christiani*, c. 10. *Staročeská kronika tak řečeného Dalimila* adds two angels to the vision, with them standing on either side of Wenceslaus. On the *Legenda*, see Třeštík, *Počátky*, p. 7-9, passim; Kuźmiuk-Ciekankowska, *Święty*, p. 156, 180. Wenceslaus participated in military campaigns, yet, according to the *Legenda*, he never stained his hands in blood; Kuźmiuk-Ciekankowska, *Święty*, p. 179. See also Schreiner, 'Signa victriccia', p. 44-63

192 Clm 14510 fol. 71v-72v.

a churchman and every soldier should pray for victory to be given by this sign of God.¹⁹³ The same thing took place at Liudprand's Birtan, where a nail from the True Cross is in the Lance. Thus, in both cases there is a strong notion of the importance of the True Cross.¹⁹⁴

Widukind provides a different description of the battle. He begins with an account of Henry going to Lotharingia to make this duchy join his cause. He leaves some of his people in Saxony to protect his cities, but those guards are unwilling to fight. When Otto appears at the gates of Dortmund, the garrison surrenders. Afterwards, the King moves the army in the direction of Rhine. Upon this, Henry and Gisibert do the same on the other side of the river. One of Henry's men, named Agina, comes to Otto and says that his master wants to defeat him swiftly and with style. When he is interrogated by the King about the peace or battle, the Saxon ruler sees many banners has come close to the part of his army that already crossed the Rhine and were at a place called Xanten.¹⁹⁵ Otto discovers that there is no way to send help as the river can be crossed there only by ships. To make matters worse, they have heavy luggage with them, so they are hindered by it and cannot

193 Goldberg, "More Devoted", p. 66-67; Goldberg, *Struggle for Empire*, p. 131-32; Bachrach, *Religion*, p. 40.

Baturich's Pontifical from another manuscript – Cod. Vindob. ser. no. 2762 – was published by Franz Unterkircher. In the introduction to that edition Klaus Gamber writes that Clm 14510 is a collection of various texts of a different nature (p. 44). The printed text of *Benedictio crucis* is different to one described in Goldberg, "More Devoted"; Unterkircher, ed., *Das Kollektar-Pontifikale*, p. 120.

This prayer, with references to a banner/sign, can be found in many places. There are also some variations, see Deshusses, ed., *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, 3, p. 250; Brundage, "Cruce Signari", p. 299-302, 305; Brückmann, 'Latin Manuscript', p. 418, 424, 458. The version of the prayer described in Goldberg, "More Devoted" is clearly a modified variant of this popular prayer, which was shaped to fit the situation of battle.

The text of this *Benedictio Crucis*, apart from Clm 14510, is – it seems – in Zürich, Zentralbibliothek (in collection from Stadtbibliothek) Car. C 102, from which it was published as Gerbert, ed., 'Benedictio Crucis'; Migne, ed., 'Benedictio Crucis'; on the Zürich manuscript see Mohlberg, *Mittelalterliche*, 1, p. 113 (entry 268).

Such a way of veneration of the Cross is not uncommon. Oswald of Northumbria ordered the erection of a cross before the Battle of Hævenfield in 634 and held it in his own hands when it was fixed in the ground. After it was set, the King made his soldiers kneel and pray before it; Bede Venerabilis, *Historia ecclesiastica*, III.2; Blough, 'The Lance', p. 354-35.

194 For other example of Louis' veneration of the True Cross, see Goldberg, "More Devoted", p. 60-61, 66-67. Louis was known to always have a cross with a part of the True Cross near his body; Diplomata Ludowici Germanici, no. 66; cf. McCormick, *Eternal Victory*, p. 246-49. Having relics close by during a fight was almost typical for the Carolingian dynasty; Notkerus Balbulus, *Gesta Karoli*, 1.4; Walafrid Strabo, *Libellus de exordiis*, c. 32. It was also present in those kingdoms that were strongly influenced by them, like Aethelstan's; Ortenberg, 'The King', p. 223.

195 Widukind II.15, 17.

move at ease. In such a situation, Otto starts to pray to God, but the Lance is not mentioned here. The prayer to the 'creator and ruler of the universe' is enough to acquire help in the battle.¹⁹⁶

The stranded Otto's troops attack their enemies from front and back. Also, those in the army who knew 'Gallic language' scream in an effort to incite the rebel soldiers to retreat.¹⁹⁷ It not only defines the enemy as foreign, but also shows the Saxons' trickiness. The rebels believe that the screams are made by their own side and understand them as the acknowledgement of defeat. A common language was one of the designations of the people, where speaking a different tongue made person seem like a foreigner.¹⁹⁸

The battle itself is bloody as many of the king's men are wounded and many die. Widukind notes a name of one of the soldiers killed by Henry: Albert the Fair. During the battle Maincia, Thankmar's killer, also finds his end. All rebels are 'killed or captured, or certainly driven off'.¹⁹⁹ All they have is looted and divided between Otto's army.

Adalbert's description of the battle is without any spectacular points. It is his typical dry and compressed narrative devoid of any higher literary tropes. After Otto moves to cross Rhine, Henry and Gisbert are not only unable to stop his troops from doing so, but also lost the battle that took place near Birten. 'God granted victory' to Otto.²⁰⁰ Many are killed among the defeated, others run away. Just as in Widukind's description, there is no Holy Lance.

There are as many similarities as differences between *Res Gestae* and *Antapodosis*. When the narratives are stripped to their bare essentials, there is the same tale: two armies march at each other, a small part of the king's army crosses the river and then is overwhelmed by the stronger enemy. Upon

196 'Omnium rerum auctor et rector', Widukind II.17; Bachrach, p. 79.

197 'Gallica lingua', Widukind II.17; Bachrach, p. 79; cf. Bagge, 'The Model Emperor', p. 57-58; see here also Widukind of Corvey, *Die Sachsengeschichte*, p. 96 note 6; Koll, *Die französischen Wörter*, p. 49; Brühl, *Deutschland--Frankreich*, p. 200 note 143; for a French perspective from the late nineteenth century, see Lot, *Les derniers*, p. 308-11.

Lingua Gallica also appears in Richer, *Historiae*, IV.100; cf. on the later importance of the term in the eighteenth century, see Rickard, *The embarrassments*, p. 3-4.

198 Müller-Mertens, 'König', p. 208-09; Schneidmüller, 'Reich', p. 85; Schlesinger, 'Die Entstehung der Nationen', p. 52-53; Kahl, 'Einige Beobachtungen', p. 74, 80-81, 97-99; Rexroth, 'Volksprache', p. 280-82; cf. for a different perspective, see Bergmann, 'Deutsche Sprache', p. 165-66, 178-79; Pohl, 'Telling the Difference', p. 22-27. See also *Epistula Reginonis*; Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, IX.1.14; cf. Goetz, '"Gens"', p. 44-45; cf. Grabowski, 'Liudprand z Cremony', p. 499 note 65-66 and Eggers, *Deutsche Sprachgeschichte*, 1, p. 283-85; for a general survey of the scholarship about the language and nation, see Brühl, *Deutschland--Frankreich*, p. 181-233.

199 'Aut caesi, vel capti vel certe fugati', Widukind II. 17; Bachrach, p. 79.

200 'Deoque victoriam', Regino of Prüm 939; MacLean, p. 243.

this, the King starts praying for victory. In the end his men are victorious. Only with a closer look do differences begin to become visible.

Widukind wrote about the Saxon people, therefore he noted the deaths of famous nobles. Liudprand described a much more elevated picture. He skipped the parts where death came to Otto's troops. He also put the battle in a much more religious context, through both the quotations used and elements of the tale. For Widukind, while he used similar elements, the soldiers' valour was more important than God's will.²⁰¹ This cannot be explained by their background as both authors were men of the cloth. The difference lies more in the realm of their understanding of the legitimisation of rule. Liudprand used God as a reason for the Liudolfings' reign; they were the chosen dynasty and this was the proof of the divine source of their power. Widukind wrote about a dynasty's rights in the nation's history. While the Saxons have *fortune*, their rights are at the same time based in valour, spirit, and military strength.

The concepts behind the texts explain why Liudprand was so concerned with the size of Otto's army during the battle and why he included the Holy Lance in his description. The ideological background for his work made him put a different spin on the narrative.

Antapodosis had a strong influence on later depictions of the battle. Frutolf used some minor information from Widukind, but the style and narrative was firmly based on Liudprand's work. There is the idea of the smaller army and the longer description of Otto's behaviour. He came down from the horse and fell with tears of the people in front of Holy Lance. Then both Amalekites and Saint James are referenced. Frutolf informs that (as he read in Widukind) the place where the king's troops crossed the Rhine was near Xanten. The description of the fight itself is taken from the monk's chronicle but the conclusion, that none of king's soldiers died, is from *Antapodosis*.²⁰²

It could be argued that this chronicler based his own narrative on the ideological elements of Liudprand's work and it was his major and preferred source of information for the civil war. The other texts were used to interpolate the narrative with details. Frutolf set the Holy Lance at the centre of the battle. It is obvious that it was one of the reasons for Otto's victory.

201 Widukind II.17. Sverre Bagge has argued that Widukind described Henry and Otto mainly as Germanic rather than Christian warriors, see Bagge, *Kings*, p. 60-61, 88-93; cf. Beumann, *Widukind*, p. 210-19; Pilch, *Der Rahmen*, p. 271; Rentschler, 'Griechische Kultur'. Nevertheless, there are clear references to biblical images, Bornscheuer, *Miseriae regum*, p. 20-22; Hagenlocher, *Der 'quote vride'*, p. 193-96; Karpf, *Herrscherlegitimation*, p. 157-58.

202 Frutolf, *Chronicon*, p. 185; Widukind II.17.

On the other hand, the scholarship mostly followed Widukind's narrative. Dümmler and Köpke's book retells the story about Agina, but at the same time in their footnotes expressed great interest in other sources that could be used to strengthen their interpretation. This is seen in the description of the battle of Birten. It is based only on the *Res Gestae*, so in the main description there is no account of the prayer or the holding of the Lance. After repeating the list of victims from Widukind's work, they inform about Henry being wounded in the battle and this is taken from Liudprand. Later on they write that there was a contemporary opinion that the victory was achieved by a miracle. According to them, Adalbert and Liudprand's wondrous providence of victory leads to a contradiction with Widukind when the victims of the battle are concerned. Nevertheless, they liked the epic elements of Widukind's narrative more.²⁰³

Cartellieri, who based his description of Birten on Dümmler and Köpke's book, was even less interested in details. His description of Otto's actions is similar to Widukind's. After realising that his army was stranded while part of his troops desperately fought against the rebels, the King prays to God without the Holy Lance.²⁰⁴

Holtzmann wrote his biography in a similar way, but he did not mention Widukind and the casualties of war. The narrative is shorter and even more in Otto's favour, who while he had no such a strong connection to God was still a glorious king.²⁰⁵ In *Geschichte...* he is vague about the details of the battle. Nevertheless, there is a slight change of attitude toward how it looked. He takes *Antapodosis* as his main source of information. Interpolating the narrative with rationalisms, he notes that Otto could not help his troops because of a lack of the ships needed to transport the army, followed with a retelling of the main point of the description of the battle. While it is not stated, it is obvious that Otto won thanks to the prayer and the Holy Lance. The only thing that Holtzmann took from Widukind was not the tactics, or the trick of screaming in Gallic language, but the death of Maincia.²⁰⁶ The King is thus elevated in quite a distinct way by this historian. Such religious themes did not mean that Holtzmann's work was against the then dominant ideology. Christianity was also seen as part of the German mission of civilising the East.

203 Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 81-84.

204 Cartellieri, *Die Weltstellung*, p. 57.

205 Holtzmann, *Kaiser*, p. 33.

206 Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 122-23.

In his biography of Otto, Günter provided a very direct retelling of Widukind. There is no information from other sources.²⁰⁷ Therefore, while it is a long and detailed text, at the same time its author had limited interests.

Althoff does not present a cohesive chronological description of the rebellion in his general study of the dynasty. He moves from one subject to another and Birten appears twice. He presents Liudprand's description of the battle as semi-reliable as it shows how next generation perceived it, rather than how it looked like.²⁰⁸ Next he reminds that Otto won thanks to luck, or as people in the tenth century believed, God's help.²⁰⁹ It differs little from a similarly short text in Althoff's later textbook, which was a highly shortened version of Widukind including an account of the prayer, without the trick of using the Gallic language. Afterwards there is a semi-religious tone noting that God had a substantial role in the victory, which is of course a reference to medieval concepts, rather than reality.²¹⁰

When Laudage sat down to describe Birten, he noted only that Henry was wounded and there is no narrative about how battle looked like.²¹¹ Elsewhere he writes that Liudprand described the Holy Lance as a powerful weapon and that Otto had to know of its importance before the battle, during which he was to use it to style himself as a new Moses.²¹²

7 After the First Battle

Liudprand follows the battle of Birten with a description of Otto's actions against Eberhard in Alsace. The *Dux*, as has already been mentioned, is oppressing people there, so the ruler moves to stop him.²¹³ Then a new character appears on the pages of *Antapodosis*: Archbishop Frederick of Mainz. When the army arrives in Alsace, Frederick becomes one of the king's greatest enemies. He makes the bishops reconsider their allegiance to Otto and return home. Liudprand did not write about it, but this meant they would take with them the soldiers they had gathered for the campaign and who were under their command. This is a part of much discussed

²⁰⁷ Günter, *Kaiser*, p. 42-43.

²⁰⁸ Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 78.

²⁰⁹ Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 85.

²¹⁰ Althoff and Keller, *Die Zeit*, p. 162, 164.

²¹¹ Laudage, *Otto*, p. 117.

²¹² Laudage, *Otto*, p. 291.

²¹³ *Antapodosis* IV.27.

Reichskirchesystem, where it was assumed that the ruler was supported with troops from the bishop's retinue.²¹⁴

Therefore, Frederick acts like a traitor who has persuaded the innocent to leave Otto. But in his treacherous activity he is much more conspiratorial, as he remains with the King and made the others leave. In this way Frederick could still spew his poison and weaken the king's army.²¹⁵ Adalbert noted that before the battle of Birten many bishops ran away from the King and joined the rebels' cause: they were against God, law, and order.²¹⁶ The situation of the abandoned king is reminiscent of narratives about the small size of an army of the righteous side. Hrotsvit, who did not mention Birten, wrote that Otto was in a desperate situation surrounded by enemies and that many of his men deserted.²¹⁷

While Otto's position could be presented in a negative way, Liudprand makes it look different. Frederick is the driving force behind the bishops' actions. Otto's wrongdoing was not responsible for it. By making the king's army smaller, Liudprand again uses the image of righteousness that defeats a larger enemy.

Widukind described the situation in a completely different fashion. Frederick's fault is not treachery, but his making peace with the rebels without the king's approval. He is sent by Otto to Eberhard to make peace, but he goes further and makes a pact, with which the ruler did not agree. The Archbishop therefore 'went [...] as if in exile' to Hamburg.²¹⁸ This comes back to the main difference between the two sources. Widukind was a writer interested in political details. His narrative includes much more information about people who were important and close to the court. He includes more information about Frederick and adds ambiguity to his account of his actions. Liudprand uses broad strokes to paint the villains of his narrative. He was much more keen on using definitive statements about the characters in his tale. He minimised ambiguity and doubt and instead provided clean explanations for events. Therefore, he made Frederick into a rebel, not a disobedient Archbishop.²¹⁹ All this comes back to the difference between

214 For military service of the bishops, see Auer, 'Der Kriegsdienst des Klerus unter den sächsischen Kaisern'; Auer, 'Der Kriegsdienst des Klerus unter den sächsischen Kaisern. 2'; Reuter, "Fili"; Reuter, "Episcopi"; Reuter, "The 'Imperial Church System'"; Finck von Finckenstein, *Bischof und Reich*, p. 15-18, 28-33; Müller-Mertens, 'The Ottonians', p. 252-53; Jaeger, 'Origins', p. 200-02.

215 *Antapodosis* IV.27.

216 Regino of Prüm ad 939.

217 Hrotsvit, *Gesta Ottonis*, line 256-61.

218 'Quasi in exilium destinavit', Widukind II.25; Bachrach, p. 85; on Frederick's actions and their place in the Ottonian system of conflict resolution see Althoff, 'Der König', p. 85-86.

219 *Antapodosis* IV.27, 32.

Widukind, an author writing detailed accounts of political events, and Liudprand, expressing a more ideological approach.

Adalbert followed Liudprand's description of Frederick's affair quite closely.²²⁰ Apart from his treason and flight to the rebels under the protection of the night, the treason of the Bishop of Strasburg Ruodhard is also mentioned.²²¹

In *Antapodosis* the bishop's affair is followed by a description of the king's soldiers in Alsace, which again exemplifies the great qualities of the King having faith in God. The soldiers realise their army's small numbers and that there are too few of them to fight, therefore they ask Otto to retreat.²²² They reason that by returning to Saxony they will not only save themselves, but also save their reputations from a disrespectful flight from the battlefield. They point out that it was Henry who wanted to fight. This directly corresponds to the battle of Birten, as this took place when the King had only a few troops at his disposal. Otto's response shows that he was aware of his position. Here, Liudprand quoted Maccabees' book: '[I]f our time be come, let us die manfully, and let us not stain our glory'.²²³ This line appeared in the biblical text where Judah Maccabee dies bravely in a battle. It is well known that Widukind made many references to this book of the Bible and as it was shown by Keller he was making a conscious link between the Liudolfings and the Maccabees.²²⁴ It was one of the most popular parts of the Old Testament and Liudprand's use of this quote made sense not only in terms of literary construction, but it fit a general feeling propagated no doubt from the court. Its aim was to elevate the dynasty by a comparison to one of the greatest families of the Bible.

Following this Liudprand uses another speech to the troops to elevate the King even further. Otto states that 'it is better to submit to death for the sake of true justice than to live shamefully by escaping from that justice'.²²⁵ He immediately explains what he understands by this. Those who have faith in the strength of their army, not in God, and fight for an unjust cause, will be punished in hell. Their cause is against God, as they fight to overthrow His judgement: they doubt Otto's rightfulness to be a

220 Regino of Prüm and Adalbert of Magdeburg, *History and politics*, p. 244 note 66.

221 Regino of Prüm ad 939.

222 *Antapodosis* IV.27.

223 'Si adpropiauit tempus nostrum moriamur in virtute propter fratres nostros et non inferamus crimen gloriae nostrae', 1 Macc. 9.10; in Liudprand's text: 'si adpropinquavit tempus nostrum, moriamur in virtute et non inferamus crimen gloriae nostrae', *Antapodosis* IV.27; Squatriti, p. 162.

224 Keller, 'Machabaeorum', p. 430 and note 85 for Liudprand's quote of the Maccabees.

225 'Melius est enim pro vera iustitia mortem subire quam eam fugiendo turpiter vivere', *Antapodosis* IV.27; Squatriti, p. 162.

successor to Henry. Those who are on the king's side, even if they are going to die, can be sure of an eternal life. If this reasoning was not enough, the speech ended with a clear statement that a refusal to participate in a just battle because of a lack of soldiers is in reality an act against God, as it is the equivalent of doubting him. There are many elements of a typical battle speech here.²²⁶ Its objective is not to explain a particular victory, as happened in the case of Birten, where similar means were used to show that Otto's pious behaviour gave him an upper hand in a battle. In this case Liudprand was concerned with creating an image of a ruler, a great pious king.

In Frutolf's account there is a longer quote about the conflict taken from Widukind. This covers the part not described by Liudprand, for which a monk from Corvey was the only source. When Frutolf was able to take the information from *Antapodosis*, he did so. He followed the narrative closely with the treason of Archbishop Frederick, and while he used some of Widukind's wording, there is very little of this.²²⁷

Dümmler and Köpke begin with a summary of Widukind's account and his information on how Otto appointed men to the posts that were left vacant due to deaths on the battlefield.²²⁸ In the following narrative about the operations in Alsace they note the role of Frederick of Mainz which is taken mainly from Widukind.²²⁹ Cartellieri did the same thing.²³⁰

Holtzmann criticised Frederick for supposedly joining the rebellion as part of his pursuit of particularism, he was more interested in the good of his bishopric than of the kingdom. He also rebelled because of a conflict with the Fulda monastery, which he wanted, against an exemption, to dominate. For Holtzmann this was challenged by Otto, who always had the good of the kingdom on his mind. As for the description of the situation after Birten, Holtzmann is hardly original. Eberhard's actions around Breisach, which was noted is located on the Rhine's island, are represented. There is some account of the French affairs in the actions of the rebels.²³¹ In his biography, the description is similar but in a much more condensed form and lacks some information that Holtzmann included later, like the role of Fulda in the political situation.²³²

226 Bliese, 'Rhetoric', p. 205-07.

227 Frutolf, *Chronicon*, p. 185.

228 Widukind II.18, Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 84.

229 Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 88-90.

230 Cartellieri, *Die Weltstellung*, p. 57-58, 59.

231 Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 124-25.

232 Holtzmann, *Kaiser*, p. 34-35.

Günter also wrote about the Breisach affair together with Eberhard's plundering lands, which are most probably derived from Liudprand, while his short account of Frederick's actions are from Widukind. The responsibility of the Archbishop for the bishops' treason is among the information taken from *Antapodosis*.²³³ Althoff wrote more about Louis's influence and his importance for the conflict than about the events occurring between the battles. For example, he did not mention any looting, but only that Henry was at Breisach and that at that time Frederick and Ruodhard changed sides and joined with the rebels. Further on he notes that Eberhard and Giselbert were plundering lands loyal to the King, but this is in direct connection with the battle of Andernach.²³⁴

Laudage also describes Eberhard's situation at Breisach as only a fight with Otto, with no account of any looting. He repeatedly made reference to Louis, his influence and role in the conflict. There is also some notion of how Otto was deserted by Frederick and Ruodhard. This last piece of information was based on Adalbert's work, but Laudage noted that Liudprand also made a reference to this desertion. Writing more about the discord between the King and the Archbishop, he states that there is no need to recount the anecdote written by Liudprand. Following Widukind's account was obviously enough.²³⁵

8 Lorsch Affair

Liudprand had a specific idea about Otto as a king distinguished by his religiousness. This is the guiding principle of his entire description of the civil war. Therefore, he included a narrative about a very specific test of Otto's fitness to be a king. Liudprand wrote to Recemeund that he would 'marvel about how he overcame the passions of the soul more than how he overcame the enemy'. Having won a battle without fighting, now Otto will fight against temptation. Liudprand sets the tale masterfully. He begins with a lengthy explanation about how defending oneself from temptation is a great achievement and is rewarded by God. Only the 'perfect' are able to protect themselves.²³⁶ Whether it is a situation of great happiness or great loss, a person should be able to remain calm and sound, with their faith placed in God.

²³³ Günter, *Kaiser*, p. 44.

²³⁴ Althoff and Keller, *Die Zeit*, p. 162-64.

²³⁵ Laudage, *Otto*, p. 116-18.

²³⁶ 'Plus eum animi passiones quam hostes vicisse miraberis [...] perfectorum', *Antapodosis* IV.28; Squatriti, p. 163.

This statement precedes a narrative about a certain count.²³⁷ There are many elements of this tale that need to be fleshed out. It is set after Otto refused to retreat, even while being urged by his troops to do so. The king's forces are small and many of his soldiers left him. It is a moment of his greatest weakness. If Otto were the wrong person for the post, then he would be depressed. In hope of this, the unnamed count, who was very rich, has an idea of how to use the situation for his own gain.

This count has many soldiers. When he noticed how things are, he decides to grasp something for himself, using the state of the affairs as a warrant. He 'car[es] not for inner man', that is his soul, 'but for the outer one', which is the material world.²³⁸ Because of this, he wants to blackmail the King: if the count does not get what he wanted, he will leave Otto and take his soldiers with him. He presumes that as the king's army is in a difficult situation, Otto will not dare to lose any more troops.

On this premise, he sends messengers who are to ask for a very rich Lorsch abbey, with which the count will pay for his soldiers and their service.²³⁹ But Otto is very thoughtful and can see plans within plans. Therefore, he sees what lies beneath the request made by the count and replies that he needs to speak with him directly. This is understood by the blackmailer as an acceptance of the offer.

As Körntgen noted, the story about Lorsch puts Otto in a position where he had to decide between giving the monastery to the count, which would provide a short-term advantage, or retaining God as an ally.²⁴⁰ Therefore, it is important to see what Otto said in the meeting. He begins with a quote from the Deeds of the Apostles, when members of Sanhedrin ask the Apostles, prosecuted for teaching about Christ, why they continue even though they are prohibited from doing so. The Apostles reply that they should obey God rather than men.²⁴¹ In *Antapodosis* this is followed by a quote from the Gospel of Saint Matthew, where he repeats the teachings of Christ:

237 *Antapodosis* IV.28. This could be a certain Guntram, who was prosecuted for treason in the Augsburg 952 council; Zotz, 'König Otto I., Graf Guntram und Breisach', p. 64 note 1 and p. 70-73; cf. Liutprando, *Antapodosis*, p. 517; Liudprand, *Liudprand*, p. 501 note 144.

238 'Non interiorem, sed exteriorem considerans hominem', *Antapodosis* IV.28; Squatriti, p. 163.

239 *Antapodosis* IV.28; for Lorsch, see: Innes, 'People', p. 414, 422-23; cf. Innes, *State*, p. 245-46. What this count wanted is *precaria*. Otto would borrow the monastery from the Church and use it for his own gain. It was one of the standard elements of the king's policy, but it led to some complications when the Church wanted to get these offerings back; Bachrach, *Warfare*, p. 89-91. On *precaria* see also Constable, 'Nona et Decima'; for different use of this word, see Wood, *The Proprietary Church*, p. 746.

240 Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft*, p. 59.

241 Acts 5.29.

'Give not that which is holy to the dogs'.²⁴² Otto also points out that count is threatening him, not begging for a mercy of award. Next he states that giving the abbey to this man would be wrong. It was founded by religious people and was already part of a different world, one of contemplation and spiritual thoughts. Giving it to the count will mean stripping it of its glory and returning it to the material sphere. At the finale of his speech Otto tells the count that he shall never receive anything from him and that if he thinks about treason, then he should do so without further wait. Claudia Garnier has written that the story shows the lack of the demanded *humilitas petitionis*, instead having *auctoritas comminationis*, was the reason for the counts' failure. He acted wrongly and was punished for it.²⁴³

The answer of the count is swift, his face showing that he realises his wrongdoing; he falls to the feet of the King and 'confessed that he had sinned'.²⁴⁴ This is reminiscent of the ritual of surrender and the same pattern of behaviour can be found in *Historia Ottonis*, where after being captured Benedict V is led to Otto and Pope Leo VIII. After being confronted with his sins, he has a chance to defend himself, but instead he falls at their feet and exclaims that he has sinned.²⁴⁵ Althoff pointed out that such actions were common in Carolingian times and later.²⁴⁶ To make the ritual work, the guilty person must spontaneously acknowledge his wrongdoing and this

242 'Nolite dare sanctum canibus', Matt. 7:6; 'Nolite sanctum dare canibus', *Antapodosis* IV.28; Squatriti, p. 163. Otto's reaction was correct since holy things should not be traded. He had to act contrary to what Althoff called the 'mentality of a merchant' ('Mentalität eines Kaufmanns', p. 147); Althoff, 'Staatsdiener', p. 147-48.

The way in which Otto replied and the use of the quotation from the Gospel shows a remarkable similarity with Rather's notion that Church properties, gifted 'either for feeding the poor or for the priests' livelihood' ('alendis collatum est pauperibus siue sacerdotibus') should never be given by the king to other people. Referencing Lev. 27.21 and Num. 18.9 he stated that what was 'offered to Lord is sacred' ('Quicquid Domino offertur [...] ad ius pertinet sacerdotum'); Ratherius Veronensis, *Praeloquiorum libri VI*, IV.34; Reid, p. 154. For Staubach this was an example of Liudprand taking inspiration from Rather; Staubach, 'Historia', p. 481.

Rather sent copies of *Praeloquia* to many people and Liudprand himself wrote something that could be called a glowing review of it: 'book [...] with sufficient humour and urbanity. Anyone who reads it will find several polished things there about this condition that will please the minds of readers no less than it will uplift them' ('in quo faceta satis urbanitate [...] librum [...] Quem si quis legerit, nonnullas ibi hac sub occasione res expolitas inveniet, quae legentium intellectibus non minus placere poterunt quam prodesse'), *Antapodosis* III.52; Squatriti, p. 138. For copies of *Praeloquia* see Head, 'Postscript', p. 252.

243 Garnier, *Die Kultur*, p. 81-84.

244 'Peccasse [...] confessus est', *Antapodosis* IV.28; Squatriti, p. 164.

245 *Historia Ottonis* 22.

246 Althoff, *Die Macht*, p. 75.

is what the count does.²⁴⁷ Typically, he should also beg for mercy from the ruler and it would be granted without any doubt, as the structure demanded this.²⁴⁸ Here the narrative ends abruptly.

Liudprand put the whole story in line with the conflict between God and the devil, as Otto was called the 'athlete of God',²⁴⁹ and he fought against the 'ancient enemy' and defeated 'visible enemies but also the invisible ones'.²⁵⁰

Why did this rich count even make this request? Why did he want to acquire the abbey and what did Otto perceive and realise when he first heard about it from the messengers? The answer is stated at the end of the chapter. The count was inspired by the devil, who wanted to hurt the King, but was unable to do so through the rebellion.²⁵¹ He could not hurt his body, as Otto came through the battles without receiving any harm. Therefore, he made a different attack. If the count acquired the abbey, the results would be tragic. In short, if Otto accepted the request, he would offend God, but he again emerged as a victor in the eternal struggle between the forces of light and dark. He is a great ruler not only because of his victories

247 Althoff, *Die Macht*, p. 74, 75. Sometimes the outcome of the ritual could be different and end badly for those who fell at the feet of king. See Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum*, VI.32 and VI.18; such a ritual could be manipulated to achieve different goals than those agreed; Buc, *The Dangers*, p. 103-06; Althoff, *Die Macht*, p. 35-37; Goetz, 'Spielregeln', p. 42-46..

248 Cf. Althoff, *Amicitia und pacta*, p. 21-36.

249 'Adhleta Dei', *Antapodosis* IV.28; Squatriti, p. 164. This is an often used figure of speech; Bruno of Cologne was also given this name (*VMrp*, c. 9). It was also used in reference to the monks in early monasticism; Herren and Brown, *Christ in Celtic Christianity*, p. 14. Saint Ladislav of Hungary was known as an 'athlete patriae'; Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers*, p. 188; Walafrid Strabo used 'athleta Dei' to describe Saint Gall; Walafrid Strabo, *Vita s. Galli confessoris*, I.11; Gumpold used it to describe Saint George and Wenceslaus; Gumpold, *Passio Vencezlai*, c. 3, 21; cf. also *Tempore illo* c. 10.

While it was often used regarding saints, it was mostly a reference to Saint George; Breul, ed., *The Cambridge Songs*, p. 74. It was connected to the more martial approach to sainthood, as a constant fight with the devil, cf. Herren, 'Aldhelm', p. 83. Saint Avitus was called so in context of his participation in a war between the Goths and the Franks, see *De S. Avito Eremita*, c. 3; cf. Delbrück, *History of the Art*, p. 399-400; Smith, *War*, p. 159. Samson of Tottington called many times Saint Edmund by this name; Samsonus Abbas, *Opus de miraculis sancti Edmundi*, I. incipit, I, II.7, 13.

On *athleta Dei* in Liudprand's text see also Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft*, p. 60, 62, 156.

In eleventh and twelfth centuries the *athleta Dei* was used in connection with crusading ideology. It is then that the story about Avitus and Edmund was written and the militarization of the saints is clearly seen; Bastert, 'Heros und Heiliger', p. 207-08; at that time Charlemagne was called an athlete of Apostle James the Greater; Boutet, 'Charlemagne', p. 22-23. For a critical view of the importance of the crusades for creating this idea, see Jäckel, *Der Herrscher*, p. 76, 107-09.

250 'Visibiles, verum etiam invisibiles [...] hostes [...] antiquus [...] hostis', *Antapodosis* IV.28; Squatriti, p. 164.

251 *Antapodosis* IV.28.

on a battlefield, but also through his defence of his soul. This is why, as Liudprand explicitly states, God is fighting on Otto's side. This follows the overall line and tone of *Antapodosis*. Henry I refuted the simony and by this shows his faithfulness.²⁵² Otto refuses to give up that which was given to God for support in a war. Berengar II on the other hand oppressed the Church and used money from it for his own gain. He embezzled the sacred property, when he took the money collected for their protection from the Hungarians for himself.²⁵³ Otto could have used the abbey to win his war with the rebels. It would be reasonable behaviour, but he was a greater king. Therefore, he will not lower himself to such dishonourable action.

This story is repeated by Frutolf. He cut out the more theological elements seen at the beginning and at the end, but the bulk of the narrative remains. It begins with the count who, realising that Otto's army dwindles, feels that he is in a position where the King could not refuse any demand and so he expresses a wish to be granted Lorsch. Frutolf then left out the story of how Otto first replied to the count and jumps straight to the speech which is taken verbatim from *Antapodosis*. The story ends with a sentence, which is a short paraphrase of Liudprand's description of the submission of the count and then Frutolf moves on to different matters.²⁵⁴

Historians when looking at the story of Lorsch abbey, were not interested in the deeper meaning of the narrative and Otto's reaction to the demands. For them it was mainly information about the dreadful state of affairs at the time, which for once Liudprand described truly.²⁵⁵

Dümmler and Köpke present the story as being based on what really happened. They note Adalbert's information that Queen Edith was staying in Lorsch at that time. The situation of the King was extremely difficult, as it was the moment when the crown might have been taken from his grasp. Others would be afraid, but not Otto. His courage and steadfastness had to be rewarded in the final victory, which he deserved.²⁵⁶

Holtzmann was also clear about his acceptance of the narrative about Lorsch. He quotes Otto's supposed reply taken from the Gospel of Matthew, but the story ends abruptly without the conclusion. *Antapodosis* was

²⁵² *Antapodosis* II.27.

²⁵³ *Antapodosis* V.33. This chapter was included in the second redaction.

²⁵⁴ Frutolf, *Chronicon*, p. 185-86.

²⁵⁵ Becher, 'Loyalität', p. 84.

²⁵⁶ Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 90-91. Edith's stay at Lorsch was discussed by Leyser who wondered whether Adalbert's information (Regino of Prüm ad 939) had any reference to *Antapodosis*, Leyser, 'The Ottonians', p. 90-91.

used, but without specifics.²⁵⁷ In his biography he set the narrative about Lorsch in a slightly different way. Instead of including it in the description of rebellion, it appears later in the book between two sections: 'Order reform' ('Klosterreform') and 'Statesman and Commander' ('Der Saatsmann und Feldherr'). Here he focuses more on what happened afterwards, writing that Otto's speech was successful; the count remained loyal. As a conclusion to this, Holtzmann states that for Otto there were no compromises or concessions when the interests of the state were at stake. Here, while there is no mention of Liudprand as the source of the narrative, Holtzmann states that Widukind wrote about Otto, that he was consistent in his actions and loyal to his friends.²⁵⁸ From the description it looks like the Church and religion were of no importance. Otto took this action only because of the good of the realm, not out of any religious duty.

Günter noted the gloomy atmosphere around Otto, and he closely followed Liudprand's narrative about Lorsch. He does not mention the 'dogs' quote comes from Bible. Nevertheless, he repeats the king's speech to the count and latter's begging for forgiveness.²⁵⁹

Althoff was of the opinion that the story about Lorsch abbey was gossip or an anecdote, which Liudprand used to defame the enemies of the King.²⁶⁰ A somewhat different approach was presented by Laudage. He never discussed Liudprand's story, but used it in a strange way. Describing the relations between Otto and Edith, he wrote that the King compared her with something 'sacred' ('Heiligen') that should not be given to dogs. Notes show that he based this interpretation on a combination of Adalbert and Liudprand's accounts and as Edith was in Lorsch at the time of the supposed request, the whole story becomes about her.²⁶¹

Comparing the very rational approach to Liudprand's story, certain things need to be noted here. This is a very good example of later writers taking the information from the sources out of their context. Laudage's idea of Otto calling his wife this way is preposterous. As also is the notion that this was only gossip,

²⁵⁷ Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 125-26.

²⁵⁸ Holtzmann, *Kaiser*, p. 144-45, names at 187.

²⁵⁹ Günter, *Kaiser*, p. 43.

²⁶⁰ Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 78. Althoff called the story an anecdote but saw some reference to Guntram-Prozess. The aim was to defame the king's enemies, cf. Althoff, 'Geschichtsschreibung', p. 161-62.

He also mentioned this story (marking it as an irony, p. 307) in an article about being famous in the Middle Ages, as it created a positive view of Otto (Althoff, "Gloria et nomen perpetuum", p. 308). It is clear that in his disdain towards Liudprand, Althoff followed Lintzel who marked the text as anecdote, a fable; Lintzel, 'Die Mathilden-Viten', p. 163-64.

²⁶¹ Laudage, *Otto*, p. 25-26, 305.

or a tale aimed at the king's enemies. The tone and extensive use of well-chosen biblical references point to a different explanation. This was an element of a larger composition which glorified the ruler through his religious acts.

9 Battle of Andernach

While Otto proving himself through the protection of Lorsch is a strong point in the narrative, it does not mark the end of the civil war. The King had a limited role in it, but even then the narrative is used to underscore the idea of close connection between his rule and his pious behaviour even more. The account of Gisibert and Eberhard's end begins with a line from Psalm 80 (81), in which King David first gathers the faithful and invites them to happily praise the Lord, followed by the stricter admonition to listen to God. The quote is concerned with the proper behaviour of the people. If the Israelites act according to God's teachings, they will defeat their enemies. But they refused to do so and therefore they were oppressed. This Psalm, as Augustine noted, is about a person's inner weakness. By acting on the orders of the heart, demons and the devil, one loses the chance of greater victory.²⁶² In *Antapodosis* Otto is compared with the position of King David and the Israelites. The rebels, who fought against the king, are described as the biblical enemies. The victory over them was in a way a proof of such an attribution. The difference is that the King acted according to the plan laid out by God. Therefore, he achieves victory over his enemies.²⁶³

Upon hearing that Otto was in Alsace, Gisibert and Eberhard gather a large army and cross the Rhine in Andernach. They attack the king's possessions there. This is similar to Eberhard's action around Breisach. The rebels are not interested in battles or in fighting against soldiers, instead normal people are their main target.²⁶⁴ Two righteous noble-men (Conrad and Udo) are there, but they do not have an army strong enough to defeat them. Here, God proves, as it was foreseen in the text, that acting according to his wishes shall be rewarded. Their troops, motivated by the 'inspiration' and not by 'speech', follow their enemies who are burdened with the great loot from the raid.²⁶⁵

²⁶² Augustine of Hippo, *Enarrationes*, 80.17.

²⁶³ *Antapodosis* IV.29.

²⁶⁴ *Antapodosis* IV.29.

²⁶⁵ 'Non locutionis, sed inspirationis', *Antapodosis* IV.29; Squatriti, p. 165.

The description begins with the loyalist army meeting the distressed priest, who has been robbed by the rebels (which again shows that they were never interested in a proper war). He informs them about his misery, and says that Giselbert and Eberhard are at that moment returning to the other side of the Rhine. Most of their army has already crossed the river with their loot. Giselbert and Eberhard are dining with their 'most trusted soldiers'. Therefore, the rebels' army is divided and weakened, vulnerable enough that it could be defeated by the king's followers. The difference between Otto and his allies is this: the King might win a battle against much stronger enemies, while his men need help to do so. The priest ends with a wish directed at the rebels that it 'may it turn badly for them', which it does. The elevated soldiers move so swiftly, that it looks like they 'flew, not galloped'.²⁶⁶ The whole narrative is very short and direct. Eberhard died in the fight and Giselbert, attempting to escape, drowns in the Rhine. Their people meet a similar fate and they survive only through their capture.

Liudprand ends the chapter and his description with: 'Thus you see in what way the Lord lowered his hand on those who made trouble for a king whom he recognized as walking in his ways'.²⁶⁷ Their victory is a proof of Otto's righteousness. He does not need to fight battles himself as God is the one who shows the truth and serves justice. The rebel's situation is rather ignoble. They are actually robbers, bandits, and thus their fate had to be decisive. The priest represents their victims: a man of the cloth who normally should be wounded only by pagans. Clergy, as well as peasants, belonged to a different order than men of the sword.²⁶⁸ Here a priest is robbed by Christian *duces*.²⁶⁹ The negative impact of their actions is therefore doubled.

This could be compared with what Orderic Vitalis wrote about the Avengine troops in 1136 who attacked churches and killed many priests 'as pagans do', following this with a statement that these soldiers were led by weak commanders.²⁷⁰ They should be able to enforce discipline and proper behaviour, but they failed. He adds that troops 'ate the flesh raw or

266 'Electis militibus – quod nec bene vertat [...] non eos currere, sed diceres transvolare', *Antapodosis* IV.29; Squatriti, p. 165.

267 'Vides igitur quemadmodum super regem tribulantes Dominus manum miserit, quem in viis suis ambulasse cognovit', *Antapodosis* IV.29; Squatriti, p. 165.

268 The medieval conception of law was very strict in enforcing greater punishment for wounding or killing a priest, see Burchard of Worms, *Decretorum Liber Sextus. De Homicidiis* 8. Cf. Strickland, *War and Chivalry*, p. 281–83, 317–20; Austin, *Shaping Church Law*, p. 166–74.

269 *Antapodosis* IV.29.

270 'Aethnicorum more', Ordericus Vitalis, *The ecclesiastical history* XIII.26 (v.72); Chibnall, p. 471.

half-cooked without salt or bread'.²⁷¹ This was not an isolated case of criticism made against those who raided churches.²⁷² Their lords were criticised for these crimes against churches and God punishes those who are guilty of this.²⁷³ It is also seen in another story from Orderic, in which Roger of Conches, unable to capture a Norman stronghold in La Croix-Saint-Leufroi, attacks Church properties. He takes not only priests and their wealth with him, but also captures people who ran to the monasteries in order to escape the war. With those prisoners, he moves back and in a manner similar to Gisbert and Eberhard, he is defeated. He is unable to fight off the Normans, as he has sent away most of his troops with loot and prisoners. Throughout the text Orderic notes that it was God's vengeance that made Roger lose.²⁷⁴ There are similarly disapproving words in Widukind's text where he holds Thankmar responsible for his soldiers' robberies and other crimes against innocents.²⁷⁵ This also helps to strengthen Otto's case. He defends the Church and his people. It is a reference to the just war explanation, where kings should protect Christians from heathens.²⁷⁶

Giselbert and Eberhard also proved their wrongdoing through their behaviour just prior to the battle. Sending off soldiers with loot is wrong. Cosmas of Prague wrote about how King Vratislav sent his son Bretislav with two strong squads to Meissen to avenge the death of his men, who fell after a disagreement with the citizens of the village Kyleb. The bohemiaans pillage, burn, and loot it. On the road back home they arrive at the bank of the river, where Bretislav has sent ahead most of his troops with the loot. Then, together with his bravest warriors, he decides to eat dinner near the river. The feeling of slackness is increased as Bretislav decides to strip his armour and take a bath, because it is a hot day. Certain Alexius reminds him that he is still in enemy territory and instead of having a rest, he should move fast back to his homeland. After this urging is disregarded, Alexius makes a wish that God will show who was right. The Bohemians are then

271 'Crudas uel semicotas carnes sine sale et pane comederunt', Ordericus Vitalis, *The ecclesiastical history* XIII.26 (v.73); Chibnall, p. 473; on the meaning of eating raw food see for example Maenchen-Helfen, *The World of the Huns*, p. 14-15; Smythe, 'Insiders and Outsiders', p. 69-70; Isaac, *The Invention*, p. 199.

272 Strickland, *War and Chivalry*, p. 317-18.

273 Strickland, *War and Chivalry*, p. 81-84; Jamieson, "Sons of Iniquity", p. 99-101.

274 Ordericus Vitalis, *The ecclesiastical history* XIII.27 (v.75-7); cf. Strickland, *War and Chivalry*, p. 82; for other example cf. p. 83.

275 Widukind II.11; cf. Leyser, 'Warfare', p. 198; cf. Hincmar of Reims, *Admonitio ad episcopos*, XIII-XIV.

276 Nelson, 'Violence in the Carolingian World', p. 91; cf. for other examples of criticism of attacking churches, Stone, *Morality*, p. 101, 105-06.

engaged by a group of 20 Saxons, who lead them into a trap. The Bohemians take many casualties and while in the end they are victorious, it is shown clearly that Bretislav has acted unwisely.²⁷⁷

Sending loot ahead, together with most of the army, almost always leads to a tragic finale. The army should never be divided in such way. Even when the chosen warriors are brave and strong, it is a mistake. It is also unwise to celebrate one's triumph while the fighting is still taking place.

Widukind presents the origins of the battle differently. Sometime after their previous clashes with the King, Eberhard and Giselbert decide to return to fight and both push for a battle. Otto besieges cities which are loyal to Eberhard, and therefore the rebels decide to move from Lotharingia toward the Rhine and attack the people there.²⁷⁸ The battle itself is described in quite similar terms, as their troops are shown returning with the loot they had taken from innocent people during raid. They have fewer soldiers than usual and are attacked by Hermann. In the ensuing battle, Eberhard is killed with spears as he holds a sword in his hand. Giselbert dies when the ship on which he is fleeing sinks with his men as too many people board it. His body is never found. Hearing about this, Otto thanks God for the victory. He also makes Otto, son of Ricwin, the new *Dux* of Lotharingia and returns to Saxony. In the same chapter Gerberga, the widow of Giselbert, becomes the wife of the King of France, Louis.²⁷⁹

In Adalbert's text, after the rebels led by Giselbert and Eberhard move to Andernach to cross the Rhine, they are attacked by Conrad and Udo. In the ensuing battle Eberhard dies and Giselbert drowns.²⁸⁰ The text follows Liudprand quite well, but leaves out narrative elements. Hrotsvit wrote about Andernach in a similar way. She shows Udo attacking and defeating the rebels with a note that his army was large. The depiction of the fall of Eberhard and Giselbert resembles what is known from other sources. The former dies by sword, while the latter drowns.²⁸¹

In all three descriptions of the battle there are also ideological concepts that can be excavated only through looking at the different motifs used by their authors. There is in fact a much older tradition behind the narrative which further highlights the need for a closer reading of the texts. To understand its meaning, the Proto-Indo-European theme of a threefold

²⁷⁷ Cosmas of Prague, *Chronica Boemorum*, II.39.

²⁷⁸ Widukind II.24.

²⁷⁹ Widukind II.26.

²⁸⁰ Regino of Prüm ad 939.

²⁸¹ Hrotsvit, *Gesta Ottonis*, line 283-87.

death must be explained. It is a concept of a person who is killed by three elements: fire, iron, and water. Sometimes it is shortened to only two: iron and water. For some it was a part of mythological ideas about the sacrifice of the kings.²⁸² This type of death could be also connected with the Christian concept of crime and punishment. It was some sort of appropriate penalty for those who committed high crimes.²⁸³ In form the punishment in a narrative should be connected with the offence, especially when committed against the common people.²⁸⁴ Georges Dumézil's concept of Three Functions makes drowning a repercussion for an attack on the third function, productivity, that is for robbery and looting. Death by the sword would be connected to the second function, military action, and would be a suitable punishment for atrocities carried out in war.²⁸⁵ In these narratives punishment occurs at the moment of their taking gratification for their crimes.²⁸⁶

Here Gisbert and Eberhard are attacked while they were eating a triumphal meal. After looting people and churches the rebels celebrate. Most probably, they eat what they have taken from their victims. They gather only the closest men around them. This was just like in tales about evil kings, who are attacked by mice during a meal. At first, they try to escape, but it is to no avail. While typically it would be expected that all the rebels would receive the same end, Liudprand divided the deaths equally among his characters. Not all three elements of the concept of threefold death are present, but there is enough to see the motif. It is seen in the ways of death were divided.²⁸⁷ All that takes place is prophesied by Liudprand in a Biblical quote.²⁸⁸

282 Aitchison, 'Regicide', p. 108-11 (examples p. 113-5).

283 Rekdal, 'From Wine in a Goblet', p. 228-30.

284 Tacitus, *Germania*, c. 12; Ward, 'The Threefold Death', p. 127; Banaszkiewicz, *Podanie*, p. 194, 202.

285 Banaszkiewicz, *Podanie*, p. 204-05; for other examples, see Ward, 'The Threefold Death', p. 124-27.

286 Banaszkiewicz, *Podanie*, p. 206.

In Gregory of Tours *Libri historiarum* Emperor Valens orders monks to serve in his army and had those who opposed this punished. His army is destroyed in a war against the Visigoths and he, wounded with arrow, hides from his enemies in a small hut, which is destroyed by fire from above. Thus, Valens was not buried. Gregory says that this was a punishment for shedding the blood of the monks; Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum*, I.41. Gregory based his story on Jerome's Chronicle, but he added the crime – punishment element; Jerome, *Translatio Chronicorum*, col. 507-08.

287 Like Hadding and Hunding, where the latter drowns in beer and the former hangs himself (see Saxo Grammaticus, 1.8.27), cf. Ward, 'The Threefold Death', p. 123; Dumézil, *Du mythe au roman*, p. 128-46. See also a polemic with Dumézil: Kroesen, 'One Hadingus'.

288 For the importance of prophecy see Evans, 'Agamemnon', p. 158-59; cf. Ward, 'The Threefold Death', p. 135-36, 137-38.

Such an interpretation is strengthened by *Casus...*, where three deeds of Conrad Kurzbold are mentioned: the discussion of rebellion; the killing of a lion that escaped from a cage and jumped on King Henry, and a duel with an enormous Slav. The last story is compared to David and Goliath. Ekkehard noted that there were many stories told about Kurzbold. Therefore, it could be presumed that these tales were a part of a longer narrative about a great hero. After the rebellion begins, Gisbert and Eberhard send envoys to the *duces* of Swabia and Bavaria and wait for them at Breisach. They place their troops on their ships and spend time playing a *tabula*.²⁸⁹ Then Conrad attacks, having only 20 warriors. First, he strikes the ship on which Gisbert is attempting to escape with a lance and sinks it together with everyone on board. Next, he slashes Eberhard with his sword, to punish him for his rebellion.²⁹⁰ Ekkehard's story is constructed of similar elements as are in Liudprand's account. While there is no attack on the civilian population, the rebels are clearly marked as being punished for their actions. Moreover, the attack is made at the moment when the rebels are triumphant. Here the feast is changed to a game. It is clear that the narratives of the battle follow a well-established pattern. They represent the common notion of appropriate punishment for a crime, where death exemplifies wrongful behaviour.

After his narrative on Andernach, Liudprand turns his consideration to Otto and his situation. The King is not aware of what has happened and prepares for a fight. He realises that this will mean his death, as he cannot win against the rebels who are far stronger.²⁹¹ It is clear from the narrative that there are many more rebels than those who remain loyal to the King.²⁹² Liudprand wanted to stress Otto's good qualities, so he had to have an army smaller than his enemies. Therefore, his decision not to run away from the rebels shows his courage and piety. The fact that he had previously won in a similar situation at Birten is not contradictory with what happens here in the narrative. Liudprand presents Otto as a brave king, who would fight his enemies even if it ends in his death.

289 Cf. Paul the Deacon, *Historia gentis Langobardorum*, I.20, where King of Heroli Rodolf/Rudolf decides to send his army to battle, while he plays *tabula*. This leads him and his army to destruction and death. Traditionally, this was interpreted as showing that his failure stemmed from his pride, but there is another possibility. Playing *tabula* was a way of symbolically fighting the battle; by losing both Rodolf/Rudolf and his people showed that they did not have luck and providence; Banaszkiewicz, 'Rudolf, król Herulów', p. 25-29. On *tabula* see Bubczyk, *Szachy*, p.15-20, 25-29; Bubczyk, *Gry*, p. 19-25, 33-39 and: Gamer, 'The Earliest Evidence'.

290 Ekkehard IV, *Casus Sancti Galli*, c. 50.

291 *Antapodosis* IV.30.

292 This is contradicted by other sources where it is noted that after Birten and the untrue gossip that Henry died in it, the rebels' army dwindled and the King's rose; Kamp, 'Konflikte', p. 176.

While the King does not fight, he gladly accepts the dangers of the battle. His reaction exemplifies his qualities and again points at Liudprand's aim. Otto calmly puts on the armour, mounts a horse and goes to a church to pray. Before their deaths, Gisbert and Eberhard feasted and robbed a man of the cloth. Otto, as a pious Christian, acts in different way, but before he got to the church, he saw a messenger hurrying to him. When this man realises he has been noticed, he starts to show joy and happiness, but at the same time slows his pace and prepares to meet a king. He makes his clothes and hair look good.²⁹³ When he finally comes to Otto, his greeting is also longer than normal. While the King is shown as being patient, his retinue almost demand information from the messenger. Therefore, to calm them, King says few words to the messenger.

Otto asks him to give his speech backwards, that is to first state the facts and only later give a rhetorical performance. He should forget about the people present and their position and go straight to the problem. He can greet them afterwards. The King and his retinue 'prefer to rejoice with rustic simplicity rather than try out Ciceronian witticisms'.²⁹⁴ In this sentence Chiesa saw a reference to Aelius Donatus' *Ars Maiora*. This Latin grammarian wrote that: 'Asteism is a figure of speech with many meanings and numerous strengths. For instance, it is said asteisms is absent of whatever rustic simplicity and is refined with enough urban witticism'.²⁹⁵ Asteism could mean an 'ironic tone'.²⁹⁶ In short Liudprand used a sentence explaining a rather complex rhetorical concept and twisted it to state the contrary thing, as a joke.

After this the messenger swiftly tells him that two rebels have died, but before he can elaborate, he is stopped by the King. Otto dismounts from his horse and starts to pray and let his tears flow. Afterwards, he moves to the church where he continues his prayers. Otto acts as a good king here.

293 *Antapodosis* IV.30.

294 'Malumus enim rusticana simplicitate laetari quam Tulliana facetia periclitari', *Antapodosis* IV.30; Squatriti, p. 166.

295 'Astismos est tropus multiplex numerosaeque uirtutis. Namque astismos putatur / quicquid simplicitate rustica caret et faceta satis urbanitate expolitum est', Aelius Donatus, *Donati Ars Maior*, III, 6.

296 Gaunt, *Troubadours*, p. 16; Haidu, *Aesthetic Distance*, p. 17-19 see especially note 34 on p. 19. Althoff and Christel Meier saw it as an example of the king's irony and a way of marking his sovereignty. It is difficult to discuss such a bizarre interpretation, as they did not recognize the main joke, because they were unaware of Liudprand's use of Donatus, as they did not use Chiesa's edition; Althoff and Meier, *Ironie*, p. 71, 226. Clearly contrary to their views, the sentence should be put in Liudprand's mouth and not seen, as they do, as the remnant of Otto's real reaction. It is also actually more of a joke, than an ironic sentence.

His victory is possible only thanks to God's wishes, because he is a good Christian. It is stressed here, that victory was achieved thanks to his faith, as he was chosen by God. In Widukind's account he notes only that after Otto was informed about the outcome of the battle, he thanked God.²⁹⁷

The comparison of *Res Gestae* and Liudprand's work leads to certain conclusions. In *Antapodosis* Andernach is a great battle, but Widukind describes it as more of a conventional fight, where the greater army defeats the weaker one. Additionally, Liudprand stresses many times that Otto was risking his life, and there is an impression of great danger for the King, much greater than is found in *Res Gestae*. This is again an example of how Liudprand was more interested in the elaborate ideologically driven narrative than was Widukind.

This is due not to a different 'facts', but to the way in which he described events. Widukind and Liudprand's basic premise is the same. There is Gisbert and Eberhard's raid against the king's lands, the return to Lotharingia with the loot and a surprise attack. The battle is also depicted in a similar fashion, as both authors note that Eberhard died in the fight and Gisbert drowned. Even Otto's prayer appears in both texts. Contradictory information concerns only minor details of the narratives, such as Eberhard dying by spear in *Res Gestae*, but by sword in *Antapodosis*. The important difference is the meaning of each tale, achieved by distinct phrasing and the expansion of different points in the story. Widukind describes the battle and ends it with the death of the king's enemies. Liudprand was more concerned with eschatology and theology, where a battle was the proof of God's will. Everything happened according to the great plan and characters in the narrative were only pawns in God's hands.

Hrotsvit's depiction of the aftermath of Andernach is very similar to Liudprand's. She wrote that Otto was unaware of the outcome of the battle, but when informed, he was sad because of the death of so many people. This sadness is compared by Hrotsvit to David's sorrow after the death of Saul. Otto also prayed to God, thanking for his help and protection.²⁹⁸ It was not uncommon for Otto to cry after the defeat of his enemies.²⁹⁹ Hrotsvit used the image of Otto's tears repeatedly throughout her work.³⁰⁰

297 Widukind II.26.

298 Hrotsvit, *Gesta Ottonis*, line 287-315.

299 Leyser, 'Early Medieval', p. 38-39.

300 Lees, 'David', p. 21-28. According to Lees, Hrotsvit used these scenes as a way of criticizing Otto, p. 222. For a different view, see Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft*, p. 66-67, 70-72; Kratz, 'The Gesta Ottonis', p. 204-05; Wailes, *Spirituality and Politics*, p. 228, 230. The understanding that

Hrotsvit and Liudprand created a spectacular story about Otto's reaction to the news about the battle. A prayer after victory was a common element of many narratives. For example, after the battle of Dyle in 891, where the Franks led by Arnulf defeated the Normans, a special procession was set up to celebrate the victory and thank God for it.³⁰¹ Before entering conquered Barcelona, Louis the Pious held religious celebrations.³⁰² There is also the example of the battle of Fontenoy. After Lothar retreated from the field, the victorious Charles the Bald and Louis the German gave orders for the gathering of the dead to be buried with all that attention demanded. After this the armies were supposed to fast for three days, even though their victory was held to be a sign of God's justice.³⁰³ They have sinned by killing people in a battle and so they have to do the penance. Such an act was the proper reaction to the outcome of a battle.³⁰⁴ All of this was often done by the Carolingians after battles.³⁰⁵

When Frutolf wrote about the battle of Andernach, he followed Liudprand, but left out the references to the Bible and the higher elevation of Otto. Nevertheless, his account is clearly based on *Antapodosis* with only minor adjustments and compression. The part in which Otto is informed about the outcome of the battle is even more compressed, but it still depicts him on the road to a church, his prayer, and all the rest. All this is given without details or digressions.³⁰⁶

Frutolf follows this with Richer of Reims's text on the conflicts between Otto and Louis. He uses the name *Belgica* to denote Lotharingia. Richer's Otto is

it was a way of praising Otto is seen also in Wolfram, *Conrad II*, p. 152; Stevenson, *Women Latin Poets*, p. 100. Cf. also Karpf, 'Von Widukinds', p. 562-63.

301 *Annalium Fuldensium (continuatio Ratisbonensis)* AD 891; Bachrach, *Religion*, p. 41; for a general survey see: Garipzanov, *The Symbolic Language*, p. 46-52.

302 Astronomus, *Vita Hludowici*, c. 13; Bachrach, *Religion*, p. 41.

303 *Nithardi Historiarum libri IIII*, III.1; Bachrach, *Religion*, p. 41-42; Nelson, 'The Search for Peace', p. 108.

It has to be noted that the religious reaction might come from shock at how bloody this battle was, Gillingham, 'Fontenoy', p. 254-55.

304 Hincmar wrote about atoning for the sins of those who died (it is based on 2 Macc. 12.43); Hincmar of Reims, *De regis persona*, c. 15.

305 Bachrach, *Early Carolingian*, p. 147-49, 154, 156-58; for example Louis the Pious in Thegan's work claimed that he won thanks to God; Theganus, *Gesta Hludowici Imperatoris*, c. 15. Charles Martel was to win against the Arabs in the battle of Poitiers 'with Christ's help' ('Christo auxiliante'); *Chronicarum quae dicuntur Fredegarii*, c. 13; Wallace-Hadrill, p. 91. Cf. McCormick, *Eternal Victory*, p. 391-92. For other examples of seeing an outcome of a battle as a *Iudicium Dei* see Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum*, VI, 41; Julian of Toledo, *Historia Wambae*, c. 10. Cf. Graus, *Volk*, p. 456-57; Banaszkiewicz, 'Włócznie i chorągiew', p. 6-7.

306 Frutolf, *Chronicon*, p. 186.

marked as someone who wanted to conquer *Belgica*. He also notes that Henry I won over the duchy against an order. Henry was made a king in Saxony only in order to fight the Slavs and so his other ventures were usurpations. Otto's attack is avenged by Giselbert, who here is Louis' subject. He ravages the lands on the other side of the Rhine and returns with loot. When his army is ready to cross the river, it is attacked by Otto's. In an unnamed battle Giselbert dies when trying to flee. The clash is bloody and many of the king's men fall.³⁰⁷ Frutolf changed some elements of the text. First, he makes Louis an invader by depicting him attacking the part of *Belgica* which was owned by Otto. Later, he describes the accusations against Henry as false. The final sentences in Frutolf's account are quite interesting: he uses the account of 'Gallicus scriptor' to show that not only a 'Saxonicus' described the end of Giselbert in such a way. This was intended to make the story more trustworthy.³⁰⁸

The way in which scholars used these sources to write about the battle in their work shows their approach to the text. For example, while the footnotes would lead a reader to think that for Dümmler and Köpke Widukind was the source of their description of the battle of Andernach, it is mainly rooted in *Antapodosis*. Not only Hermann, as in Widukind's text, but also Conrad and Udo participate in the battle. Their army is quite small and there is the story of the priest who informs about the rebels' ignoble actions. While the return of most of the troops to the other side of the Rhine is also in *Res Gestae*, Dümmler and Köpke were clearly inclined to base their narrative more on Liudprand. It is seen in the way they phrase the sentence about how Eberhard and Giselbert choose those who are to stay with them in enemy territory. The description of the casualties on the rebel side was clearly derived from Liudprand's text. It seems that only Giselbert and Eberhard's deaths are taken from Widukind. The description is complemented with other sources, like Flodoard: what was probably the body of Giselbert is found by fisherman and then buried in a hidden place.³⁰⁹ The end of the description becomes more ironic, when Dümmler and Köpke quote the sentence that Liudprand attributed to Eberhard, who was to say to his wife, that she now holds a *dux*, but soon it will be a king. They also note that Giselbert was especially missed by the Lotharingian monks because of his interests in enlarging Church properties and monastic reform.³¹⁰

307 Richer, *Historiae*, II.18-19.

308 Frutolf, *Chronicon*, p. 186.

309 *Les Annales de Flodoard*, 939.

310 Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 91-93. This was also investigated by Joseph Depoin, who used the sources on Giselbert's religious activities to note the proper date of his death, see Depoin, 'La mort'.

Later they return to Liudprand as their main source. So Otto is on the road to a church when he is informed about the outcome of the battle. In reaction to the victory, the King steps from his horse and falls to his knees to thank God for the unexpected victory. His whole reaction shows not a triumphalism over his enemies but sadness over the loss of two formerly loyal men. His enemies are crushed thanks to God and besieged Breisach has also surrendered.³¹¹ Cartellieri does not add anything to this.³¹²

Holtzmann limits himself only depicting the most important elements of the affair. Otto sends Hermann, who is called a 'faithful *Dux*'³¹³ together with Udo, Conrad and Swabian troops against his enemies. They meet with Giselbert and Eberhard's army on 2 October 939, as Holtzmann painstakingly notes. The rebels' troops are divided and most of them are on the other side of the Rhine when attacked. The end is swift as Eberhard dies in battle and Giselbert drowns in the river. This victory saves Otto, and when the King is on the road to church, he hears about the outcome of the battle and then steps down from his horse to pray. Holtzmann adds that according to Widukind God divided the Conradines.³¹⁴ While he did not mention Liudprand's name in this context, it is clear from his narrative that he was the more useful source. The impression given by the text is that Otto was a ruler chosen by God. He never states it directly, but the tone and phrasing lead to such an interpretation.

Holtzmann also noted that after the battle of Andernach, Breisach fell. Overall the most interesting element seen here is that while he used Liudprand's chronicle, it is never pointed at. It looks as though he was aware of the lesser reputation of Liudprand's work and used Widukind as a cover that what he wrote was correct. It was not a mistake, but rather a conscious decision to legitimize Liudprand's information by appealing to Widukind's textual authority.

In the older biography the description is much shorter. There is a battle and its end and that is almost all the reader can gather from his narrative. A comparison of the depiction of the immediate aftermath of Andernach in both books is somewhat strange. In Holtzmann's biography there is no mention of Otto going to a church, when he is informed about the result of the battle. There is a note that victory at Andernach saved the King, but that is all. The elevating elements of Liudprand's description used in *Geschichte...* are nowhere to be found. Instead, the description is in more secular form.³¹⁵

311 Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 93.

312 Cartellieri, *Die Weltstellung*, p. 59-60.

313 'Treuen Herzog', Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 126.

314 Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 126.

315 Holtzmann, *Kaiser*, p. 35.

Günter's version returns to Liudprand's account of the battle of Andernach. Udo and Conrad decide to move against Eberhard and Giselbert's raiding party. They are not sent to do so by Otto, but act on their own. Before the battle they meet a priest in a narrative which is taken from *Antapodosis*. The army loyal to Otto attacks the rebels and in the ensuing battle Eberhard is killed and Giselbert drowned when he tries to escape on a ship. Nevertheless, Günter never mentions that Otto was informed about the outcome of the battle when he was on the road to a church, although at the close, he notes that the war was won thanks to God's judgement.³¹⁶

In his study Althoff notes the effect of the battle, and how Eberhard and Giselbert died, but his description is limited to practically this information.³¹⁷ In a more recent book Althoff has called Andernach a second miracle of Otto's reign. He notes that Udo and Conrad attacked Giselbert and Eberhard when most of their troops had already crossed the Rhine and in the battle the latter was killed and the former drowned in the river. He uses information which is very like Liudprand's account, and which is taken from Dümmler and Köpke, that many rebel soldiers were either captured or killed.³¹⁸

Laudage's account is even more condensed. He writes that on 2 October 939 Udo and Conrad defeated the rebels at Andernach and that Eberhard was killed and Giselbert drowned.³¹⁹

10 Aftermath

While there was a final battle, the war was still going on. Liudprand used this to strengthen his ideological points. The only enemies left were Henry and Frederick, who was now a full-blown rebel. Liudprand reminds his readers that it was Frederick who instigated the bishops to desert the King. Here it is revealed that he was working with Henry and, according to his wishes, gathered an army in Metz to be used after Giselbert and Eberhard's return. Together they would have many soldiers to use in the planned attack on Alsace, where the King was based. But then the news comes to Frederick that Giselbert and Eberhard have died.

Instead of continuing with his account of the Archbishop's fate, Liudprand moved his interest to Otto and his stay in Alsace. The King decides to occupy

³¹⁶ Günter, *Kaiser*, p. 44-45.

³¹⁷ Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 85.

³¹⁸ Althoff and Keller, *Die Zeit*, p. 164.

³¹⁹ Laudage, *Otto*, p. 118.

Franconia. After this digression, Liudprand writes that the citizens of Mainz were so much afraid of the King, that they did not let Frederick into the city.³²⁰ Soon afterwards he is captured and sent away into exile in Saxony. Later, he is forgiven, thanks to the king's mercy, and returned to his post.

This leaves Henry as the sole rebel. Afraid of Otto, he wishes to hide in Chèvremont castle. According to Liudprand, this was well protected not only by a garrison, but also by nature.³²¹ Henry is prohibited entry by Giselbert's widow. She speaks to him with strong words.³²² Gerberga's speech is full of quotations from classical texts. Its basic message is that because of her loyalty to Henry, she lost her husband. Welcoming Henry into the castle would only add to her misery. Liudprand uses a distinct line from Cicero's *Speech against Catilina*. It is from a part where he cast Catilina from the city saying, 'You cannot remain among us any longer'.³²³ The similarity between the texts is strengthened by the lengthy enumerations of evil things that are connected to Catilina and Henry's presence. The speech moves Henry to change his disposition. Surrounded by bishops, he walks barefoot to the King and falls on the ground in front of him.³²⁴ This clear ritual-like behaviour is continued by Henry's request for mercy. Otto's reaction is a proper one. First, he says that what Henry has done is clearly wrong and actually it should not be forgiven, but that as Henry has humiliated himself before Otto, he will not be harmed.³²⁵

This act of begging for forgiveness is reminiscent of the conflict between Louis the Pious and his son Lothar. According to Nithard, in 839 after some preparations, there was a great spectacle meant to demonstrate Louis' mercy and formation of an alliance with his son. It took place at Worms where,

320 *Antapodosis* IV.33.

321 *Antapodosis* IV.34; in Widukind's work it appears in a quite different context. As Giselbert was besieged there, after the battle of Birten and it was difficult to capture, thanks to the terrain, Otto was forced to leave it; Widukind II.22; supposedly because of Louis d'Outremer's attack on Alsace, Otto raised the siege and moved with troops against him; Regino of Prüm ad 939; cf. Bachrach and Bachrach, 'Early Saxon', p. 41.

322 *Antapodosis* IV.34.

323 'Nobiscum versari iam diutius non potes', Cicero, *In Catilinam*, I.10; Macdonald, p. 43.

Liudprand also quoted Terentius, *The Lady from Andros*, but it seems to be an example of his fascination with the Roman writer. Terence was one of his favourite writers and he quoted him many times; Liudprandus Cremonensis, *Opera Omnia*, p. 231-32. On Liudprand and Terence see Giovini, 'L'Antapodosis'; Giovini, 'Papa Giovanni XII'.

324 *Antapodosis* IV.35.

325 *Antapodosis* IV.35; the general understanding is that Henry was forgiven by this act; Garnier, *Die Kultur*, p. 124-25; on the ritual, see Koziol, *Blaganie*, p. 220, 224-27 (for additional examples of such behaviour) and p. 243-49; Barrow, 'Demonstrative', p. 144-45, 147-48, 149. Cf. Liudolf's submission to Otto in Widukind III.40.

during the assembly, Lothar fell to Louis' feet and stated that he had sinned. He was forgiven and the discussion of an alliance proceeded.³²⁶ This was clearly a reference to the Biblical story of the prodigal son. The phrasing of Lothar's exclamation towards Louis bears a striking resemblance to it. It evokes the same feeling and ends with the same return to grace as in the Gospel of Luke.³²⁷

Otto's younger brother is sent to Ingelheim to be held there until there is no longer any anger in the ruler's heart.³²⁸ After consulting with his advisors, the King will then decide upon his fate. While there is no continuation of this narrative, from the way everything is described up to this point, there is a quite big difference between the Saxon king and his Italian counterparts. The latter were unable to end a civil war.

Describing the aftermath of the conflict, Liudprand also wrote a tale which connected Otto to Italian affairs. It begins with the powerful Margrave Berengar of Ivrea who begins to conspire against Hugh of Arles. Informed by Lothar, Hugh's son, about his imminent capture and blinding, Berengar escapes to Swabia, with his wife following shortly afterwards.³²⁹ Upon his arrival, the *Dux* Hermann presents him to 'the most pious King Otto', who receives him warmly with many gifts and attention.³³⁰ Liudprand, if the reader did not already know this, reminds that the greatness of a king might be seen in the way he welcomed Berengar and how he was repaid with guest's 'wickedness'.³³¹ Liudprand makes his readers aware that Otto acted gallantly and there was no gratitude in exchange.

Realising that his enemy has escaped, Hugh sends messengers promising various rewards if Otto will refuse to welcome Berengar. But the Saxon king is above such practices. He does not refuse Berengar, and instead gives Hugh an answer which explains his actions. Margrave was admitted to the King's presence not with rebellion or the deposition of Italian king in mind, but on contrary, Otto wants to make peace between them. Therefore, he will not accept the proposed gold and silver, and instead he will give gifts to Hugh himself. This, Liudprand wrote, is a proof of his love towards the Margrave.³³²

326 *Nithardi Historiarum libri IIII*, I.7. Cf. Althoff, 'Das Privileg', p. 116–21.

327 Luke 15.21; cf. Fałkowski, 'Double Meaning', p. 179; Althoff, *Die Macht*, p. 60–64. Cf. Theganus, *Gesta Hludowici Imperatoris* c. 55; see also Koziol, *Blaganie*, p. 217; the similarities with the Gospel were seen also by Schutz, *The Carolingians*, p. 108; Riché, *The Carolingians*, p. 158.

328 On Otto's anger and why it was just and correct, see Freudenberg, 'Darstellungsmuster'.

329 *Antapodosis* V.10.

330 'Piissimi regis Ottonis', *Antapodosis* V.12; Squatriti, p. 178.

331 'Improbitalis', *Antapodosis* V.12; Squatriti, p. 178.

332 *Antapodosis* V.13.

In a later chapter Liudprand wrote that Otto could not help him because other things stopped him and also because of many gifts Hugh sent.³³³ When the Margrave finally returned to Italy, he was accompanied by Swabian soldiers.³³⁴ In this way, Liudprand hid the King's role in Berengar's rise. It was obviously a problem for the chronicler and his patron. *Antapodosis* was written after the Margrave showed disobedience toward Otto, who was in a much better position to become a king in the peninsula.³³⁵ Liudprand painted a very grim portrait of Berengar's reign. There is no positive information about him, which fits with what Liudprand wrote in the second introduction to *Antapodosis*, where he stated that it was retribution for Berengar's evil deeds.³³⁶

During his return to Italy, Berengar received help from Otto. Liudprand described things in a way which showed that his patron was protected from any fallout coming from this alliance. He did it by accepting the basic facts of Berengar's escape to the north and Otto's welcome, but he stressed the more positive aspects of the situation. Otto is represented as being merciful and the reader can see 'how holy and humane' he was³³⁷. He wanted to bring peace to the south and this is why he welcomed the Margrave. On the other hand, he never describes Berengar as having been loyal toward the King, but clearly identifies him as someone who will be ungrateful. Otto has no direct part in Berengar's return to the south. Even in the story there are only Swabian soldiers. It might easily be seen as a private operation with mercenaries taken from the duchy. In this way, Otto remains a ruler without any stain on his character.³³⁸

The final descriptions in both *Antapodosis* and *Res Gestae* which directly correspond are concerned with aftermath of the civil war. Henry's final submission is much calmer in the latter, depicted as deserving his brother's mercy, but it was more of an armistice than peace.³³⁹ Henry still hopes to acquire the crown and to do so he gathers many supporters through the distribution of gifts. He plans to kill his brother at Easter, but thanks to

333 *Antapodosis* V.18.

334 *Antapodosis* V.26.

335 On Berengar's actions against Otto's allies, see Regino of Prüm ad 952; for the background of the later intervention in Italy among many others, see Zielinski, "Erben", p. 756-58; Hehl, 'Kaisertum', p. 221-27; Sergi, 'The Kingdom', p. 356-57; Althoff and Keller, *Die Zeit*, p. 207.

336 *Antapodosis* III.1; cf. Buc, 'Italian Hussies', p. 207, 210.

337 'Sanctitatis quantaeque humanitatis', *Antapodosis* V.12; Squatriti, p. 178.

338 Cf. Krahwinkel, *Friaul*, p. 293; Fasoli, *I re*, p. 149-60; Wickham, *Early Medieval*, p. 179; Maleczek, 'Otto', p. 181.

339 Widukind II.29.

Hermann, Udo, and Conrad the Red the plot is exposed and those guilty of it are captured or killed. Henry is then forced to run away from the kingdom.³⁴⁰ Sometime later, both brothers make peace. Otto makes Henry the *dux* of Bavaria after the death of Berthold. From then on he is an ally of the King and makes victorious wars against the Hungarians.³⁴¹ The story is completely different and both authors show their own visions of the past.

Some of these differences cannot be explained by Widukind having more information than Liudprand. In *Antapodosis* Henry's subjugation is much more fleshed out. Yet the text ends before Henry has been completely forgiven. Widukind gives his readers much more information about what took place between Andernach and the subjugation of the king's brother.

Henry's later plot to kill Otto is found in Hrotsvit's *Deeds of Otto* but with more religious overtones. Here it is Jesus Christ who reveals the plot and she adds that the conspiracy was hideous also because of the choice of Easter as the day to kill the King.³⁴² Henry does not participate in it. It is as if he had no part in the plot. Nevertheless, he runs away from the King. Here Hrotsvit adds that Henry had pain in his heart, because of his conflict with Otto. After some time, he risks standing in front of the King, but only after he has made special preparations. First, he sneaks into the royal palace on Christmas day. After removing his jewellery and footwear, he dons plain clothes and 'amid the venerable hymns of Holy Night' he goes into a church and then throws himself on the floor in front of the altar.³⁴³ Upon this, Otto grants him mercy.

Adalbert did not base his description of the aftermath of the battle of Andernach on Liudprand. After his victory, Otto enters Lotharingia and forces it into submission. At the same time, he welcomes Henry whom he forgives and makes him the *dux*. Henry's rule is quite short, as the Lotharingians soon expel him. In the following year he conspires again, joined by many Saxons and the Archbishop Frederick. The whole plot against Otto ends swiftly. The King orders the beheading of the conspirators, Henry is sent into a custody at Ingelsheim and Frederick has to show his loyalty in a public ceremony where he makes a pledge on the Eucharist. Only at the end of the year is Henry finally forgiven, when he escapes from his custody and appearing in front of the King after Christmas he falls at his feet.³⁴⁴

340 Widukind II.31.

341 Widukind II.36.

342 Hrotsvit, *Gesta Ottonis*, line 316-35.

343 'Inter sacratos noctis venerabilis hymnos', Hrotsvit, *Gesta Ottonis*, line 356; Bergman, p. 61.

344 Regino of Prüm ad 939-942.

To better understand Liudprand's story, it has to be compared with what he wrote about Constantine Porphyrogenitus.³⁴⁵ When Constantine's father dies, he succeeds him, but in reality he has been stripped of any power; Romanos Lekapenos took over his reign and even became emperor himself. Later, this usurper is deposed by his own sons – Constantine and Stephen – and sent into a monastery. Porphyrogenitus is next on the list to be taken care of, as the conspirators feel endangered by his popularity. This does not happen, as Constantine is prepared. He captures Romanos' sons and sends them to the same monastery as their father. Constantine is saved thanks to a man named Diavolinus. He was initially behind Romanos' fall, but then changes sides. He proposes a way to eliminate the two brothers. The troops who attempt to capture Porphyrogenitus are countered by loyal Macedonians who swiftly take Constantine and Stephen away from the palace and shave their heads.³⁴⁶

The tale shows that both injustice was punished and that the crime of deposing their father brought the brothers a bitter fruit. From the opening of the tale, it is obvious that the proper ruler of the empire should be Constantine Porphyrogenitus, whose father previously reigned as emperor. The rebellion and palace coup of Romanos was not only against the law, but also against justice. His sons' conspiracy was in a way a punishment for their father's evil deeds, but they were also wrong, as they acted not only against the God's law, but also against their own family. Their fall was therefore a form of justice, just as in the struggle between Otto and Henry.

Romanos, who thanks God upon hearing that his sons are being sent to the monastery to be with him, later prays and asks the Lord for protection from 'the unjust corruptor'.³⁴⁷ The overall tone of his actions, which is made in a form of a poem, shows that his rise happened according to the devil's wishes.

Apart from an exclamation, in which Romanos says to God that, 'You deigned by your grace to cast down the unjust ones', only once God's role is mentioned: his sons' fall is because of his 'just judgement'.³⁴⁸ Just before this appears Diavolinus' speech to Constantine which includes a notion that 'divine justice', which has been ignored by the conspirators, will help

345 On Constantine, see: Toynbee, *Constantine*; Runciman, *The Emperor*; Tycner-Wolicka, *Opowieść*, p. 20-23.

346 *Antapodosis* V.21-22.

347 'Corruptor iniquus', *Antapodosis* V.24; Squatriti, p. 188.

348 'Gratia dignatus tibi sit quod pellere iniquos', *Antapodosis* V.24; Squatriti, p. 188; Colonna, *Le poesie*, p. 209-10, for the similarity between this poem and the poem about Henry's rebellion discussed above. The whole discussion of Romanos prayer – poem is on p. 203-12.

him.³⁴⁹ This shows that Porphyrogenitus was chosen to be an emperor and that the evil men would be punished. But there is more, as the one who prays was Romanos, while the notion of a higher order was mentioned by Diavolinus and God mentioned by the narrator. Constantine is not shown praying, and he became a ruler through conspiracy and treachery, after which he showed no mercy to his enemies.

Diavolinus, who helped Constantine, actually inspired the brothers to act against their father. Next he prepared a similar plot against Constantine, but then betrayed the conspirators. Diavolinus is a strange name. In the manuscript overseen by Liudprand the original hand wrote *Diabolinos*, but was then corrected by F2.³⁵⁰ It seems that the scribe understood the name as having a double meaning. *Diabolinus* could mean someone who belongs to the Devil. His actions fit with such a description in many ways, as he is treacherous and evil. Liudprand called him the 'instigator' of the brothers.³⁵¹ Such behaviour fits a devilish persona. Therefore, he could be the one who Romanos calls 'the unjust corruptor'.

Such a name would fit Liudprand's sense of humour. The devil betrayed God, while man betrayed men. But this also shows that Byzantine affairs were connected with evil deeds. The 'divine justice' in the rise of Porphyrogenitus does not invalidate this assumption. The devil and his actions were in many ways a part of the higher order of things. There is one problem with all this however, as Diavolinus really existed. His name was Michael Diabolinus. In the *Continuation of Theophanes* he is responsible for exposing the plot to overthrow Constantine Porphyrogenitus.³⁵² Leo the Grammaticus mentions him in the same role.³⁵³ Diabolinus also appears in the Greek sources in connection with things that took place after the deposition of Lekapenos' sons.

Comparing that narrative to the text about Otto, it seems obvious that the Saxon king won in a more dignified way. There was no conspiracy but steadfastness. There was no Diavolinus, but God and faith. On every occasion

349 'Divinae [...] iustitiae [...] iuditio', *Antapodosis* V.22; Squatriti, p. 187.

350 *Antapodosis* V. 22; Liudprandus Cremonensis, *Opera Omnia*, p. 136.

351 'Incentor', *Antapodosis* V. 22; Squatriti, p. 186.

352 Theophanes Continuatus, *Constantini Imperium* c. 6.

353 Leo Grammaticus, *Chronographia*, p. 330; cf. Runciman, *The Emperor*, p. 234, where it is stated that Liudprand mixed his description of the earlier Constantine's coup with the later one connected with Stephen, and p. 236 about the situation in December 947. Günter Prinzing proposed to read Diavolinus as a marker of ancestry from the bishopric Diabolis (Devol), which was located north-west of Kastoria; Prinzing, 'Epiros', p. 90 note 6; Prinzing, 'Spuren', p. 761. See also Liutprando, *Antapodosis*, p. 537.

Otto expresses the belief that he is acting with the higher plane in mind, and has prayed and shown faithfulness. Constantine, who regained his power thanks to God, never thanked God for it. He defeated his enemies by means of cloak and dagger, and not the cross.

In Italy civil wars are fought, and blood is spilled. The kings who have lost supporters surrender. Hugh of Arles is deserted by many of his followers. Milo Count of Verona is a victim of the King's rule and joins with Berengar. Bishop Wido of Modena wants to acquire the abbey of Nonantola and for this departs from Hugh.³⁵⁴

In response to this, the Italian king gathers his army and moves to capture Wido's castle Vignola, but he is unable to do so.³⁵⁵ As soon as Berengar rushes to Milan, Hugh decides to withdraw to Pavia, while 'all the magnates of Italy' change sides and leave the King.³⁵⁶ He is in the same position as Otto was when he began to lose men because of Frederick's actions. Here is the difference between the two rulers. The Saxon put his faith in God, while the Italian decides to withdraw. Hugh sends his son Lothar to the Italian magnates offering him as a king and then departs to Burgundy taking all the treasure of the kingdom. Later, in what for Luidprand is a typical description of Italians, they promise the fleeing ruler that they will accept him as a king in the future.³⁵⁷

Hugh then meets Raymund on the road to Burgundy. He is a prince of the Aquitanians, that is the ruler of Provence. He offers to reconquer Italy for Hugh for 1000 coins. But this does not happen as, before the invasion could proceed, Lothar's father dies.³⁵⁸ His mistake is that he did not place himself into the hands of God. Instead of fighting he fled, leaving his son. His way of returning to his kingdom and reclaiming the crown was to pay for someone else to fight for it.

These corresponding tales are interesting also because of the place where they are set in the narrative. The fourth book of *Antapodosis* was concerned with Ottonian affairs. The above tales are from the fifth book. It seems that after the example of good behaviour, the Bishop of Cremona presented the negative examples.

Frutolf based his description of Andernach's aftermath mainly on Liudprand. Widukind was used only to slightly elaborate on some elements of his narrative.

³⁵⁴ *Antapodosis* V.26-27.

³⁵⁵ On Vignola see Tosi, *Storia cronologica*, p. 7-15; Crespellani, *Memorie storiche*, p. 11-12.

³⁵⁶ 'Omnes Italiae primates', *Antapodosis* V.27; Squatriti, p. 190.

³⁵⁷ *Antapodosis* V.28.

³⁵⁸ *Antapodosis* V.31.

So Frutolf took the fact that Henry ran away to the Western kingdom from *Res Gestae*. It was to take place after Henry met Gerberga in Chèvremont. Later, following Widukind he wrote that, after being pardoned, Henry regained his cities and then became the *Dux* of Bavaria. The rest of the text came straight from *Antapodosis*, so it contains no conspiracy against Otto or the plot to kill him.³⁵⁹

In their book, Dümmler and Köpke mashed Liudprand and Widukind's narratives about the aftermath of Andernach into one. They took the information about Archbishop Frederick coming to Mainz from *Antapodosis*, but added other elements from *Res Gestae* and to some extent from Adalbert's text, mainly the participation of other bishops in the rebellion and their return to allegiance. Henry's actions are a case of the re-evaluation of the past. As stated in *Antapodosis*, after being reduced to the last remaining rebel, Otto's brother moved to Chèvremont to meet with Gerberga. She later became Louis' wife. The information about this marriage and Henry's flight to West Frankish kingdom was taken from *Res Gestae*. They also write about relations with the western neighbour, and Henry's submission to the King, which was mainly based on Widukind's work. An important element of this book is a description of how things looked like in Lotharingia. They describe the situation and it is clear that the successful return of these lands to the kingdom was very important for them as well as it was for Otto. Also, the idea of the Saxon king's domination over the western neighbour is strongly expressed.³⁶⁰

In their view, the final victory over the *duces* created a more unified kingdom. It was the end of the particularism of the nations of which Germany consisted. Their footnotes show that for Dümmler and Köpke Germany was equal to Franconia and Saxony.³⁶¹

Henry's conspiracy was described using Widukind's text interpolated with information gathered from Thietmar and others. After the execution of the conspirators, Frederick repeats his submission and Henry flees from the kingdom.³⁶² The description of the return of peace was nevertheless not based on Widukind's account. Dümmler and Köpke were of the opinion that the description found in *Antapodosis* was mistakenly attributed by Liudprand to the direct consequence of Andernach, and that its placement in the narrative should be moved to the end of the conspiracy.³⁶³ Therefore, where they describe the final end of the civil war, they used his

359 Frutolf, *Chronicon*, 186-87.

360 Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 93-97, 105-08, 119.

361 Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 98 note 2; it is based on Regino of Prüm ad 939.

362 Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 116-18.

363 Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 95, note 1.

text and completed it with some information, such as the date and place from Adalbert, with the role of Mathilda taken from Widukind and *Vita Mathildis reginae posterior*.³⁶⁴

Cartellieri was principally interested in how the end of the war influenced relations with the western neighbour. He wrote a lot about Louis, his marriage to Gerberga and his reoccurring claim to Lotharingia. His description of Henry's plot to kill Otto and the later reconciliation of brothers is short, devoid of any details and almost encyclopedic in nature.³⁶⁵

Even Holtzmann was very dry in his description of the aftermath of Andernach. He notes that Frederick was removed from Mainz and that Lotharingia was being pacified. There is little about the first peace between Henry and Otto, which appears without any commentary. There is more about the plot to kill the King, but this appears in another section of the book. While the rebellion appears in 'The First Struggle (936-939)', the conspiracy appears in 'Lotharingia and France (940-950)'.³⁶⁶ According to this description it seems that after being taken from the post of *Dux* of Lotharingia, Henry feels resentful. Therefore, he starts a conspiracy to kill Otto. The text is based on Widukind and Thietmar, who added some fine details. The outcome of the plot is that the rebels were executed by king's loyal men.³⁶⁷

The description of the final end of the rebellion follows *Antapodosis* and Hrotsvit's poem. Henry comes to ask Otto for mercy. He acquires it thanks to a clergyman from Mainz, who helps him to appear at the church in Frankfurt. There, Henry, wearing a simple shirt, falls to Otto's feet, begging him to forgive his rebellion. While this text more or less fits Liudprand's version, Holtzmann mentions only Hrotsvit as his source.³⁶⁸ Leaving aside the question of why he left off *Antapodosis*, this description again shows how Holtzmann was interested in a more elevated and religious vision of the past. This was an uncommon approach even in the 1930s and 40s, but glimpses of it are also present in Günter's book. Tellingly, these ideas are absent from Holtzmann's biography of Otto.

There he gives much shorter descriptions. First, he describes an almost immediate pacification of the kingdom after victory at Andernach. Breisach is captured, Mainz is closed for Frederick, who is captured by the King

364 Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 120.

365 Cartellieri, *Die Weltstellung*, p. 60-63.

366 'Die Ersten Kämpfe (936-939)', 'Lotharingen und Frankreich (940-950)'.

367 Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 127, 129-30.

368 Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 130-31.

together with Ruodhard. Franconia was pacified and only Henry is left. He surrenders to the King and Otto hopes that his ambition would be fulfilled by Lotharingia. It is after Henry is removed from his post of *dux* there that the conspiracy begins. Here Holtzmann notes that the promotion of Ricwin's son, Otto, to this post instead of Henry, was something of a failure of the King's policy and led to later problems since his brother felt hurt. The conspiracy is only lightly touched on and its description is almost limited to a note that Henry had to run away after it was revealed. In the description of the final peacemaking between the brothers in 941, he concentrates on Hrotsvit's poetic take on the story. There are only few words about the end of the conflict.³⁶⁹

Günter wrote about Henry being deposed from the post of *Dux* of Lotharingia, but makes no direct connection to his last rebellion. His description is Widukindian in nature, with a hint of Thietmar in the form of names of the executed rebels. It takes some time until the brothers reconcile. The final act takes place in 945, during Christmas, when Henry stands in Magdeburg begging for mercy. He is helped by Mathilda. After the death of Berthold, the *Dux* of Bavaria, Henry becomes the new ruler of the duchy. The description is based on Hrotsvit which is the source of the strange date of the Henry's submission.³⁷⁰

Althoff added that probably bishops' mediations helped to make peace between the brothers. Also, that there were two rituals of submission. The first one described by Liudprand happened soon after Andernach. It was then that Henry returned to good standing with the King and Althoff proved this by reference to two documents where he is called '*carus frater*'. Next there is the conspiracy to kill Otto and how it was discovered, followed by the execution of the King's enemies. When informed about what happened to his co-conspirators, Henry escapes from the kingdom. Only after some time does he move back and thanks to Mathilda he is returned to good standing and is forgiven. All this happens after the submission in Frankfurt on Christmas day, when the King is on the road to the church.³⁷¹

In his next book Althoff wrote about these affairs with a broader view on the subject. Some of Louis' actions on the border of the kingdom are mentioned there, but the focus is on the surrender of Frederick and Ruodhard, who are sent to custody. Also, Henry submits to his brother after he

369 Holtzmann, *Kaiser*, p. 35-38.

370 Günter, *Kaiser*, p. 45-47.

371 Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 86.

is turned down by Gerberga at Chèvremont. After making peace with the King, he is made a *Dux* of Lotharingia, but it does not last long, as he is soon replaced on this post. This is followed by Henry's plot to kill Otto during Easter in 941, but it is discovered and the conspirators are executed. Later, thanks to the help of a clergyman from Mainz, Henry is able to get into a position where he can appear in front of Otto and throw himself at his feet wearing only a plaid shirt and beg for mercy.³⁷²

Laudage omitted Liudprand's poetic description of how Otto was informed about the victory at Andernach, but he did write about Henry's later activities. There is Chèvremont and his begging Otto for mercy after being turned down by Gerberga. The description of the bishops' help and his falling at the King's feet which was taken from Liudprand, but Laudage noted that he felt a sense of uncertainty about it. He wondered whether it was a 'contamination' ('Kontaminatio') from later sources and events. This is because he placed the situation described in *Antapodosis*, as having taken place before the final conspiracy against Otto, which Laudage retold using Widukind's account and to some extent Hrotsvit's.³⁷³

From these narratives about the civil war comes a clear image of how Liudprand depicted Otto as a pious ruler chosen by God. This ideological construction was made by Liudprand using biblical quotes and models combined with other motifs. The objects of this operation, the battles, were described in similar terms by Widukind, but he did not follow the same ideological concepts. Thus, while from the standpoint of the simple recounting of the facts they are similar, their meaning in the narrative is not. This does not mean that he was free from using motifs or themes and described 'what really happened'. He was just interested in different ideas and placed the history in a different conceptual framework.

372 Althoff and Keller, *Die Zeit*, p. 164-66.

373 Laudage, *Otto*, p. 119.

Part III

War Against Heathens as a Road to Empire

‘Saxon Theseus’¹

‘Henry united the collapsing Reich’²

Becoming a ruler is not enough for a hero; the bloodless resolution of the conflict with Arnulf was only a start. There is a certain pattern of constructing narratives and the tales about Henry and Otto adhere to it. Therefore, before Liudprand could leave his heroes, he wanted to make a final point about their power and greatness. In the whole of *Antapodosis* there is one threat common to all parts of his Europe: pagans. They endangered the whole continent and thus defeating them is the final element in the creation of an ideal ruler. He has to be shown as a destroyer of the invaders and enemies of Christianity: The Hungarians.

Here I want to show how Liudprand and Widukind create the description of fights against the Hungarians, to refer to their specific ideas. The latter author made Henry into a new Charlemagne. His description of the fights against the Hungarians is dominated by such imaginary. Liudprand had a different idea of what he wanted to convey through depicting the fights with the Hungarians. They were the enemies of all Europe and his aim was to show their domination over all kings and princes. Only the Liudolfings were able to stand against them, as Liudprand painted an image of one family strong enough to safeguard Europe and therefore worthy of becoming emperors. This imperial idea is present in *Antapodosis* from the beginning.

The idea of a dangerous east was and is very popular in Germany and made these wars an extremely popular element of the historical narratives,

1 ‘Sachsen Theseus’, Krug von Nidda, *Heinrich*, dedication p. 2.

2 ‘Heinrich hatte das zerfallende Reich zur Einheit geführt’, Lütke, *König*, p. 98.

which later, after World War II, were minimised. It remained a part of the vision of the past, but historians tend to avoid it. These wars were seen as a particular moment in history, when Germans were united for the first time.

This also has to be discussed with an explanation of the great symbol of the Empire seen in *Antapodosis*. Liudprand used the image of the Holy Lance to create the impression that Otto was worthy of the empire. It was a special relic encompassing many traditions and meanings.

5 How Hungarians were Defeated by the Ottonians

A victory over a special enemy show that a king is truly a great ruler. In the tenth century the Hungarians were such enemies. This conflict was seen as a holy war, where on one side God's chosen Ottonians were leading their men against the heathen enemy that easily defeated all other people of what Liudprand conceived as the Europe-Empire. The Saxons' victory shows that they are the most powerful people whose strength comes not only from military prowess, but more importantly, from God's wishes.

In *Antapodosis*, the Hungarians appear for the first time when Arnulf of Carinthia invites them to attack the Moravian *Dux* Sviatopolk. In doing so, he destroys the fortifications built against them which were called 'closures'.¹ Both the use of that name and the whole idea of an enclosed doorway for the mysterious enemies is reminiscent of the apocalypse-like gates Alexander the Great closed against the people of the Gog and Magog. Arnulf's allies devastate the lands of the Moravians and then Liudprand changes the subject. But before that, he leaves his reader with a forecast: 'the Hungarians, having observed the outcome and contemplated the region, spun evil schemes in their hearts, as became apparent when events unfolded'.²

Latter events prove that this is correct. The Hungarians appear again and this time they take on Germany. It is not a coincidence that in the same (second) book of *Antapodosis* where the Hungarians attack, there is a description of Henry's rise. In the first 16 chapters that take place before Henry's rise, 15 are concerned with them.

1 Henry's Victory in the Battle of Riade

Thus, before discussing Henry's military triumph the previous event have to be examined. After the death of Arnulf of Carinthia, the Hungarians decide to invade Bavaria. Louis the Child gathers an army. If someone deserts or withdraws from the battle, he will be hanged. The battle takes place near the

1 'Clusas', *Antapodosis* I.13; Squatriti, p. 56.

2 'Hungarii [...] observato exitu contemplatique regionem cordibus malum, quod post in propatulo apparuit, machinabantur', *Antapodosis* I.13; Squatriti, p. 57.

river Lech and the Hungarians achieve victory by ambushing their German opponents. At first the Christian side has the upper hand and it seems that victory is theirs, but then the Hungarians feign a retreat. Unaware of the trap, the army begins its pursuit. There is a poem describing the battle which adapts the words of Virgil, Juvenal, and others.³ Their success in the first part of the battle is later overshadowed by the Christians' catastrophe. The Hungarians attack from every side and massacre them. The resulting situation astonishes Louis as the attackers seem to be everywhere and 'rivers and banks turned red by the blood that mixed in'.⁴ Afterwards, the raiders ravage the 'kingdoms of the Bavarians, Franks, Swabians, and Saxons'.⁵

There has been some discussion about this description. It has been noticed that Liudprand located the battle in the neighbourhood of Augsburg. For Rudolf Lüttich this was connected with later battle at Lechfeld. He had doubts about the validity of the description, as Liudprand described Hungarian tactics which were supposedly unknown.⁶ At the same time Lüttich acknowledged that other information is correct: the note about the meeting place and the punishment for those not present.⁷ Others saw *Antapodosis* as an important account of what the battle looked like.⁸

Liudprand then recounts a tale about Hungarian attacks on Italy.⁹ They had already made the Bulgarians and Greeks into tributary nations and now that wanted to do the same with the Italians. They initially send a small unit of men, who, after scouting the lands, decide that they need to gather a large army of their strongest men to win. They spend the whole winter on their preparations and when spring comes, they march into Italy. While moving through the kingdom, they avoid Aquileia and Verona and head straight to Pavia. King Berengar, for whom this was his first contact with the Hungarians, gathers army from the entire kingdom. Thanks to this great mobilization, while the Hungarians were 'numberless', the Italian army was three times the size of it.¹⁰ On the battlefield, the Christians achieve success at first and it seems that the victory will be theirs, but because of their greed and lust for gold, they become vulnerable. They are

3 Colonna, *Le poesie*, p. 73-81.

4 'Rivos et flumina sanguine permixta rubere', *Antapodosis* II.4; Squatriti, p. 77.

5 'Bagoariorum, Suevorum, Francorum, Saxonum [...] regna', *Antapodosis* II.5; Squatriti, p. 77.

6 Lüttich, *Ungarnzüge*, p. 58, note 64.

7 Lüttich, *Ungarnzüge*, p. 59.

8 Cf. Bowlus, *The Battle*, p. 85.

9 After a short digression about Adalbert Babenberg that does not exist in older versions of *Antapodosis*; see footnote in Liudprandus Cremonensis, *Opera Omnia*, p. 37.

10 'Innumerabili', *Antapodosis* II.9; Squatriti, p. 80.

massacred by the Hungarians and the whole country is left to their prey, as its defenders are dead.

It begins when the raiders come to Pavia; Berengar becomes so proud of his army that he has more faith in the numbers of his troops than in God and decides to stay with those close to him in a 'certain small town'.¹¹ When the Hungarians see the army, great peril comes into their hearts. They neither want to fight a battle, nor to run away. Eventually they decide to chose the latter option and they swim across the river Adda, where many of them drown. The Hungarians are mercilessly chased, until they are forced to ask for mercy. They offer to return everything they have looted, but the Italians reject their offer. Thus, the Hungarians decide to continue their retreat, after defeating a vanguard of the Italians. While this should have given some thought to the Christians, they continue with their proud attitude. Finally, the tired Hungarians come to the river Brenta, at the border of Italy.¹² Again, they ask for mercy, promising to give everything they have with them and even offering to swear that they will never return, handing over their children as hostages. Again, their offer is rejected.

Before the beginning his account of the battle, Liudprand includes a version of a battle speech as a dialogue. The Hungarians have no other choice than to fight. They are already doomed, so death in combat is the best option they can achieve. In this way, they will give their descendants a 'great fame' and 'κληρονομειά' – 'heritage'.¹³ Mars gives aid to those who fight and punishes those who flee. This uplifting speech uses many patterns of battle rhetoric, such as reminding the soldiers of their past glory and the appeal to Gods' help.¹⁴ They prepare their ambushes and then attack their surprised enemy. Many Italians die while eating, while some prefer to loot their colleagues rather than fight. Therefore, furious Hungarians quickly defeat the Italian army and then take their revenge on the whole of Italy.¹⁵

This chapter and the whole tale of the defeat of the Italians ends with the remark that these nomads also attacked and looted Bavaria, Franconia, Saxony, and Swabia. No one was able to defeat the Hungarians. For Liudprand's Europe these attacks are a problem on an almost apocalyptic scale.

In Widukind's chronicle the Hungarians are seen as a unifying force. After the first presentation of Henry, there is a long description of them.

11 'Quodam in opidulo', *Antapodosis* II.10; Squatriti, p. 81.

12 Grabowski, 'Liudprand z Cremony', p. 496.

13 'Famam tantam', *Antapodosis* II.14; Squatriti, p. 82.

14 Bliese, 'Rhetoric', p. 206, 214.

15 *Antapodosis* II.16.

It begins with the claim that they are the remaining people of the Huns. They are marked by two distinct qualities: a thirst for blood and love of war. Cities and settlements within reach of their bands are in constant danger of being raided and plundered. They are impossible to defeat, but there is one man who was able to do it: Charlemagne. Just as Alexander the Great had done with dangerous tribes, Charlemagne placed them on the other side of the Danube and encircled them with fortifications. As in *Antapodosis* Arnulf is here responsible for their release.¹⁶ Soon, they join the Slavs in raiding Saxon territory.

In Widukind's text it seems that the Hungarians and Slavs are creating the borders of the kingdom and wars with them define the limits of Saxon rule.¹⁷ Similarly, in *Antapodosis* Europe is flanked on one side by the Hungarians and on the other by the Muslim colony in Fraxinetum and by North African bands. It emphasises how Christianity is in danger.

That the Hungarians are reminiscent of Gog and Magog, the biblical people who represented the vile powers, who will act during Apocalypse, has already been noted. This image has a long tradition; biblical and legendary people were quite often referenced to when depicting a new danger. Procopius of Caesarea saw the Huns as such a people.¹⁸ Isidore of Seville wrote that the Goths were perceived as the descendants of Gog.¹⁹ All these ideas probably stem from Josephus Flavius, who wrote that the Scythians were the descendants of Magog. Many nomadic people were either named after the Scythians or else were connected to them, in order to explain their behaviour. The Hungarians also got genealogy from evil people.²⁰

After his depiction of the Hungarians' victory, Liudprand quotes from the book of Jeremiah. It is a text about how God sent an unknown people from afar to destroy Israel, while at the same time the Lord protected it from utter

16 Widukind, I.18-19.

17 For different view, see Beumann, *Widukind*, p. 207.

Cf. the title of the twelfth chapter of Cartellieri's book: 'Deutscher Grenschutz gegen Slawen, Ungarn und Dänen'; Cartellieri, *Die Weltstellung*, p. 28; see also the subchapter of Holtzmann's book: 'Die Schlachten auf dem Lechfeld und an der Recknitz, Italien und Spanien (955-957)'; Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 162. See also Grabowski, 'Liudprand z Cremony', p. 495.

18 Procopius of Caesarea, *The Persian War*, I.10.9-10.

19 Isidore of Seville, *Historia Gothorum*, 1, cf. Wolf, *Conquerors*, p. 15; Bietenholz, *Historia*, p. 118-26 and especially p. 121-26.

20 Vásáry, 'Medieval Theories', p. 218; on apocalypse and Hungarians, see Friedrich, *Menschen und Tiernensch*, p. 92-93; cf. about Gog and Magog in Middle Ages. see Urbański, *Tartarorum Gens*, p. 110-23; Scott, 'Against Gog and Magog'; cf. also Srodecki, *Antemurale Christianitatis*, p. 49-52.

destruction.²¹ He provides no commentary on this quote, but there is an additional meaning here. Previously in the book of Jeremiah it is explained why Israel was punished. It was because they were corrupted, both sexually and religiously. The invasion was a punishment for the people's wrongdoing; using this quote leads to an interpretation of the story as a punishment for the corruption of the Italian kingdom.²² There is an unknown enemy who is endangering the faithful, but this is all part of God's plan. Liudprand's narrative looks like a repetition of Jeremiah's construction: the Italians are punished for their wrongdoing by the heathen and mysterious Hungarians.

This leads to Hungarian attacks on Germany. They first conquer Moravia, but it is not enough for them. They occupy some regions of Bavaria and then 'destroyed castles, burned churches, massacred communities, and drank the blood of their victims so that they would be feared more and more'.²³ This is followed by a reference to Jordanes' version of the origins of the Huns and their method of upbringing children. They apparently cut the faces of their newborns, so that they would drink mother's milk while at the same time they would feel great pain. This was intended to strengthen them.²⁴ In addition to this gory tale, Liudprand argues that the reliability of the story is strengthened by the fact that the Hungarians wound themselves following a death in their families.²⁵

In this dreadful situation it seems that there is no hope, but a new ruler will be able to defend the people. In *Antapodosis*'s account the Hungarians, hearing that Conrad has died, decide to test the new king, on whether he will pay their tribute or not. If the later happened, their intention is to burn and kill throughout his kingdom. The attack is centred on Saxony, where Henry would not be able to gather troops from his *duces* and there were not many fortifications. The sense of danger is increased by the following fact that Henry is very sick. However, he is able to give an order to gather troops from all Saxony and speaks to them in a manly way.²⁶ This poem deserves particular attention.

21 Jer. 5.15-18.

22 Jer. 5.1-14. The quote has been extensively discussed. Many of the twentieth century commentators understood that the people who would destroy the Israel were the Scythians. Jerome saw Babylonians in them; Thompson, *The Book of Jeremiah*, p. 15, 86-87; cf. Reimer, 'The "Foe"; Jerome, *Commentariorum in Jeremiam Prophetam*, 5.15.

23 'Castra diruunt, ecclesias igne consumunt, populos iugulant, et, ut magis magisque timeantur, interfecorum sese sanguine potant', *Antapodosis* II.2; Squatriti, p. 75.

24 Iordanes, *De origine Actibusque Getarum*, c. 24.

25 *Antapodosis* II.3.

26 *Antapodosis* II.24-26.

The poem is a great exoneration of the Saxons. They were once a warlike nation famous for their strength and ability to defeat Charlemagne, who won in the end only because of God's will to save the Saxons for 'eternal life'. Therefore, they were a great nation, while the evil 'Turks', who were against God, took pleasure from killing his people and should be defeated. They even wanted to force a tribute from the Saxons, so in the final lines Henry asks his men to:

Lift up your spirits in a manly way!
I ask you to cut off their limbs, to slash hard at them!
Let there be a burning rage, a holy lust, against them!
Let them carry our gifts back to the waves of the Styx,
Let them count hot coins by the fire of hell.²⁷

So God's chosen warlike nation should fight the pagan hordes, who should be sent to hell. The Styx and the coins are references to classical mythology and view of Hades.²⁸ The poem was written in the popular in Carolingian poetry metrum of Terentianus Maurus which was also used by Martianus Capella, Ambrose and most importantly Boethius.²⁹ Nevertheless, it was not used much in the tenth century.³⁰ Its use here might have been a way of showing Liudprand's versatility and pride in his poetic abilities. Not only was this metrum elaborate, but the poem is also very well constructed. It begins with an introduction into the matter over two verses, followed by the *argumentum* about the past of the Saxon people. Afterwards, the new enemy (the Hungarians) appears and the poem ends with an appeal to defeat and kill them.³¹

In this way the Saxons are compared to the Hungarians. Charlemagne conquered the Saxons and Christianized them, but only thanks to God's will. By the sword he made them part of a greater society. Now there are pagan Hungarians, who disrupt the communities and destroy churches.³² Two points are made by such a comparison: first is that the Saxons were the strongest people, able to achieve victory over anyone, even the conqueror

27 'Salutis [...] Turcorum [...] Sumite nunc animos More virili! / Membra secare precor Vique ferire! / Sit furor heus ardens, Sancta cupido! / Haec Stigias referant Munera ad undas / Et calidos numerant Igne trientes!', *Antapodosis* II.26; Squatriti, p. 88.

28 *Antapodosis* II.26.

29 Colonna, *Le poesie*, p. 96-97.

30 Liudprand of Cremona, *The Complete*, p. 88 note 31.

31 Colonna, *Le poesie*, p. 98.

32 Colonna, *Le poesie*, p. 100.

of the whole world, Charlemagne. Hence, the Hungarians do not stand a chance. The second point is that military victory is a gift from God, who decided that the Saxons would lose against Charlemagne, but also that they will crush the Hungarians. Therefore, they are chosen by God. This is strengthened by the statement that the Hungarians are ignorant of Christ and enemies of God.³³

Liudprand put into Henry's speech a notion that the Christian troops should be driven by 'holy lust'.³⁴ They should act on a religious basis, where the war against the Hungarians is holy. Again, it shows that God is on Henry's side and that his troops are strong and valorous.³⁵ The wars against Charlemagne are presented as, in a way, victories and the troops are reminded of the great Saxon successes.³⁶

After this poem it might be expected that the description of the battle would appear, but Liudprand has other concerns. Conrad Leyser has argued that *Antapodosis* is highly concerned with matters of reform and Church laws.³⁷ While by this he mainly meant the bishops and their ethics, it is clear that Liudprand also recognised good and bad behaviour towards the Church as a mark of a king. Berengar II and Willa were guilty of crimes against the well-being of the Church.³⁸ On the other hand, in another speech Henry notes that God punishes those whose faith is weak and present only in words. Therefore, the King decides to prove that he is worthy of the glory of victory and to show this, he bans simony. He calls it a 'heresy' and says that it will be removed from his kingdom by any possible means.³⁹ Such behaviour was typical after a coronation; through religious reform the king confirms that he is able to rule.⁴⁰ Liudprand does not go into details about the relationship between the King and the church. The element of reform is included in his chronicle not as part of the discussion about simony, but instead as a way of differentiating between good and bad. Good kings perform good deeds. Simony is evil and therefore needs to be abolished by a good king. Throughout *Antapodosis* there is no program of a reform, but rather there is the idea that the Church needs to be protected from evil by the ruler, whether this is the Hungarians, counts craving money, and also

33 Cf. Colonna, *Le poesie*, p. 103.

34 'Sancta cupido!', *Antapodosis* II.26; Squatriti, p. 88; cf. Colonna, *Le poesie*, p. 99-100.

35 Bliese, 'Rhetoric', p. 204, 206, 208-09.

36 Bliese, 'Rhetoric', p. 212, 214.

37 Leyser, 'Episcopal', p. 795, 800.

38 *Antapodosis* V.33; cf. *Antapodosis* IV.7 and *Historia Ottonis* 1.

39 'Heresis', *Antapodosis* II.27; Squatriti, p. 88.

40 Weiler, 'Crown-giving', p. 72.

simony. This can also be interpreted not as questions about Church laws and reform, but as an element of a broader narrative construction in which evil men do evil things. Therefore, Henry and his stance against simony show that he was a good king who performed good deeds.

After Henry's command, a messenger informs the King that the Hungarians are in Merseburg, where they have captured women and children, and killed many men. A weaker king would act hastily and order an attack. He would be impatient, but Henry is different. Instead of immediately moving his army, he makes another speech. This time he says that they 'must fight for their fatherland and die nobly'.⁴¹ Only after such exhortation is the order to advance made.

Soon both armies meet and war cries are heard from both sides: 'Kyrie eleison' from the Saxons and 'Húi, húi' from the Hungarians.⁴² The Christians are on one side and those closer to the devil on the other. Throughout the sources there are many examples of screaming prayers or other such statements and here it is shown in parallel, with both good and evil cries.⁴³

Now everything is ready for the battle, but before it commences, Henry makes one last speech ordering his troops to advance in an orderly line. None of the soldiers should move faster than the rest. They should wait for the first Hungarian attack by arrows and protect themselves with their shields. After that, they should move on the enemy swiftly, not allowing him to strike again. The Saxons behave as ordered and easily defeat the Hungarians.⁴⁴

While it might seem that the poem and the King's speeches are separate texts, in reality this is a one long exhortation divided by Liudprand into smaller parts. Battle speeches such as this were one of the most common elements of a description of a fight, as the teachings of the ancient rhetoric was quite popular in the Middle Ages. They were present in historical works at least since Thucydides.⁴⁵

41 'Pro patria pugnare ac laudabiliter debeant occumbere', *Antapodosis* II.28; Squatriti, p. 89; cf. Bliese, 'Rhetoric', p. 205-06, 211-12.

42 *Antapodosis* II.30. The word *húi* is in use in Hungarian even now. It means more or less 'hip', as in 'hip hip hurrah'.

43 Franks and Byzantines also cried *Kyrie Eleison* during battles, see McCormick, *Eternal Victory*, p. 354; Haldon, *Warfare*, p. 24; Shahid, *Byzantium*, p. 175; see also *Das Ludwigslied* line 47; cf. Bachrach, *Religion*, p. 41; Meineke, *Einführung*, p. 131; Szarmach, 'The (Sub-) Genre', p. 47 also see Löbker, *Antike Topoi*, p. 216; Green, *Medieval Listening*, p. 65-67.

44 *Antapodosis* II.31.

45 Zoido, 'The Battle'; on Byzantine examples see Stouraitis, "'Just War'", p. 238-39, 247.

John Bliese has created 17 categories of the speeches that are made before battles to give a reason why the side of the speaker should win. In Henry's speech examples of five of these categories are present: a notion that being outnumbered by one's enemies is not important, while valour is; that God is on their side; giving orders and expressing the opinion that the chosen tactic will be fruitful; the reminding about previous victories and the glory of their ancestors; and recalling the damages caused by one's enemies.⁴⁶

A short and condensed description of the battle follows. The Saxons, as Henry has ordered them, attack in strict formation. After the first bolt of arrows, which thanks to their shields do not do any damage, they charge. This happens so fast, that the Hungarians are unable to fire a second time and are forced to flee. The victory is great, as all the nomads are either killed or chased off and the imprisoned Christians are freed.⁴⁷

After Henry's victory a depiction of the battle was painted in Merseburg's palace.⁴⁸ He was perceived as the great King, as he began his reign over the kingdom peacefully and defended it from the pagan nomads. Some historians have questioned the reliability of this narrative. For example, Lintzel has more trust in Widukind's account. For him Liudprand's account is full of mistakes, a fable made under the impression of the Merseburg painting, which led the author of *Antapodosis* to place the battle in the neighbourhood of the city.⁴⁹

Christopher Bowlus on the other hand saw in the painting a proof that Liudprand's description represented how the battle really looked like, as the chronicler would not falsify it.⁵⁰ Many military historians have treated the *Antapodosis* as evidence that the battle marked a change in the way battles were fought and that heavy cavalry became more important thanks to Henry's reforms. Therefore, it represented how the battle looked like.⁵¹

46 Bliese, 'Rhetoric', p. 204, 206-08, 212-13, 217.

47 *Antapodosis* II.31.

48 Cf. Keller, 'Machabaeorum', p. 435. Schramm connected this painting to those made for the Carolingians (for example Charlemagne's in Aachen dedicated to victories over the Saxons). Henry was to invoke the older tradition of memorizing the great achievements of the ruler, incorporating the Frankish tradition into Saxony; Schramm, 'Salbung', p. 305.

49 Lintzel, 'Die Schlacht von Riade', p. 99-100.

50 Bowlus, *The Battle*, p. 71 note 84.

51 Leyser, 'Henry I', p. 22-23; Bowlus, *The Battle*, p. 70-71; Bachrach, "'Caballus et Caballarius'", p. 188-89; Verbruggen, *The Art of Warfare*, p. 86. Cf. Bowlus, *The Battle*, p. 47.

Was there any change? Is this concept viable? From *Antapodosis* it is quite clear that the new military has no backing in it. Liudprand constructed his narrative to build an elevated image of Henry. The accounts of battles and military history was a means of doing this. His narrative about the battle had nothing to do with a realistic portrait of the Saxon army. The story is a reference

When it comes to the battle, Widukind again provides a different narrative to Liudprand. There is an imminent clash with the Hungarians, after the pacification of the kingdom and recovery of Lotharingia. The nomads begin a raid against Saxony, burning monasteries and killing the innocent. Henry ought to stop them, but the army, used to civil wars, is not ready to fight them off. Thankfully for the Christians, one of the invaders' commanders is captured. In exchange for his life, Henry acquires peace for nine years, gold, silver and a release of captives.⁵² This is not the same conflict as is found in Liudprand's work. The true battle against the Hungarians happened much later, preceded by victory over the Slavs. The battle of Riade, Henry's most famous military victory, was a crowning victory for him.⁵³

For Widukind, the battle begins with Henry's speech to his troops. He reminds them that the kingdom was at peace and there were no more civil wars. Now they have a new challenge: The Hungarians. Henry demands that they not only to defend women and children, but also protect churches. All of this fits the pattern of battle speeches.⁵⁴ Widukind's Henry asks his people to decide for themselves whether they wish to pay a tribute, or to fight the barbarians. The answer is clear – right hands raised and an exclamation that they will stand and fight their enemies. So, when the Hungarian emissaries ask for a tribute, they are sent back without any. Upon this refusal, the nomads attack even though their plea for help sent to the Dalmatians was met with ridicule. The Hungarian army is divided into two groups: one moves into Saxony from the south west and the other from the east. The first army is decimated by the Saxons and the Thuringians. It is a different situation in the east. There the Hungarians besiege a city, where Henry's sister has gathered a great treasure. When their siege becomes fruitless and they are informed about both the defeat of the other army and that Henry's army is now close by, they decide to retreat under smoke and fire.

Now the King gives another speech, reminding his soldiers about God's grace and that they should avenge all evils the Hungarians have done to their fatherland and their ancestors. There is an idea that an enemy would

to accounts of battles of Louis and Berengar. These kings and their armies failed because of a lack of discipline, as their troops were too proud and divided and either began looting or let themselves fall in a trap. Here, by acting wisely, Henry wins. While it is possible that Liudprand's description was reliable, these articles have more to do with their authors' wishes rather than with the source material in this specific case. This problem of interpretation needs to be stressed especially as it is unknown which battle Liudprand described.

52 Widukind I.32; cf. Lüttich, *Ungarnzüge*, p. 77-78.

53 Keller, 'Widukinds', p. 400.

54 Bliese, 'Rhetoric', p. 211-12, 216; Widukind I.38, cf. Eichenberger, *Patria*, p. 159-60.

be easily defeated if the soldiers fought well.⁵⁵ Soon battle begins and everything happens as Henry has said. The Hungarians are swiftly defeated with the King being seen in every part of the army, with an angel always nearby. When the enemy is crushed, the captured Christians are released.

In *Res Gestae* victory is followed with a great celebration. The money which had previously been given to the Hungarians is now spent on churches and the poor. Because of the victory and its aftermath, Henry is called a *pater patriae* and emperor by his army.⁵⁶ This is then strengthened by the description of many mighty people from all over Europe coming to the Saxon king and asking him for help. Widukind uses the battle as a part of his depiction of Henry as a mighty ruler. A similar construction was used in Otto's case. After the victory in the battle of Lechfeld he is called an emperor and *pater patriae* by his soldiers.⁵⁷

Overall there are three distinct depictions of conflict with the Hungarians. If the battle described in *Antapodosis* was in fact Riade, then it was placed in the wrong chronologically order. It should appear further on in the book, and not straight after the resolution of the conflict with Arnulf. How then should one understand Liudprand's narrative?

The king's obligation is to fight the pagans, and defend his Christian subjects from heathens' attacks.⁵⁸ Henry's behaviour in his struggles against the Hungarians must be seen in the context of other kings and their acts. In the ninth century Louis the German was constructing his own legitimisation in a manner different to how his brother Charles the Bald ruled the comparatively peaceful Western kingdom.⁵⁹ Charles built up his image as a great monarch in his clothes and ritual, and he was a patron of arts and knowledge. Louis, on the other hand, was a warrior king; his power came from rituals of combat. He boasted in propaganda works about his wars against pagans.⁶⁰ He is described as a *defensor christianis*, who protects Christians from pagans. His victories are proofs of God's grace.⁶¹ Such an image was connected to the much harsher reality of conflict and statehood

55 Bliese, 'Rhetoric', p. 206, 213.

56 Widukind I.39.

57 Widukind III.49.

58 Tellenbach, *The Western Church*, p. 39. Cf. Jensen, 'Sacralization of the Landscape', p. 149-50.

59 Goldberg, "More Devoted", p. 77; Kershaw, *Peaceful*, p. 212-23. Sedulius Scottus is clear that a truly Christian king should fight against heathens. While it is difficult to attest to whom the work was written, Staubach was of the opinion it was for Charles the Bald; Sedulius Scottus, *Liber de rectoribus Christianis*, c. 13; Staubach, *Rex christianus*, p. 130-31, 134.

60 Goldberg, "More Devoted", p. 58, 61, 73-76.

61 Goldberg, "More Devoted", p. 71.

in the Eastern kingdom, where magnates and the nobility demanded treasures that could be acquired from raiding. The system that emerged enabled everyone in the ruling circle to profit from warfare.⁶² This is also consistent with how Boleslav Chrobry, after his quasi-coronation by Otto III at the Gniezno assembly in 1000, had to strengthen it by making a raid on Rus.⁶³ While the exact use of motifs and the concept in Louis and Henry's cases are different, the idea behind them is fairly similar. The king had to fight pagans and defeat them to show glory and that he had God's grace. The importance of such actions is seen also in Henry's other undertakings.⁶⁴

The fights with pagans are also connected with the notion that a good ruler protects the borders of his kingdom. Hincmar wrote that this was a king's obligation.⁶⁵ Agobard saw wars against foreign enemies as *bella iusta*.⁶⁶ It should not be limited to the idea that a good war was victorious. There was a great sense of caution about this subject, which is seen, for example, in the early medieval Irish texts.⁶⁷ Augustine wrote that a good war lead to peace.⁶⁸ Fighting against pagans makes war more acceptable.⁶⁹

Henry's behaviour and attitude towards the wars as depicted in *Antapodosis* perfectly fits these concepts. He is a defender, he never takes up arms to conquer, but instead to save his subjects and the Church. His aim is to acquire peace.⁷⁰ Hence, in reality a warrior king's objective was to become a *rex pacificus*.

Later authors noticed that there was indeed a problem of having three different battles in the sources. Frutolf created his own description of the battle of Riade. He retained the two battles seen in Widukind, but began with the notion taken from Liudprand that the Hungarians wanted to test the new king. The attack that followed is the first battle from *Res Gestae*, which ends with acquiring peace. Riade is described as part of the second invasion. Here the narrative taken from Widukind is mixed with quotations from Liudprand. It is a highly shortened version of both accounts, without their poems and speeches, but it retains the important elements of the

62 Goldberg, "More Devoted", p. 58.

63 *Galli Anonymi Cronica*, I.7. Cf. Weiler, 'Crown-giving', p. 64.

64 Ehlers, 'Heinrich I.', p. 243.

65 Hincmar of Reims, *De regis persona*, c. 8; Kershaw, *Peaceful*, p. 222.

66 Agobardus Lugdunensis, *Liber Apologeticus*, c.3; Kershaw, *Peaceful*, p. 194.

67 Kershaw, *Peaceful*, p. 72.

68 Augustine of Hippo, *Epistulae*, no 189; Kershaw, *Peaceful*, p. 222.

69 Russell, *The Just War*, p. 29-31; for Byzantine views see: Haldon, *Warfare*, p. 25-26.

70 Plassmann, *Origo gentis*, p. 284-85.

glorification of Henry taken from *Antapodosis* and his elevation to *pater patriae* from *Res Gestae*.⁷¹

This combination of the tales shows that the fight against pagans was more important than the exact shape of it. In this case, the later writer chose to combine two distinct tales into one that would fit his own work. There was no problem of the historicity and reliability of the sources. For example, if a quote from Liudprand does not fit the description of Riade found in *Res Gestae*, then he simply moves it to the earlier battle. Where some sentences fit a greater and more glorious fight they are put in a later tale.

Modern German scholars have limited their interests mostly to Widukind's descriptions. Keller compared parts of *Res Gestae* to the Bible. He concentrated on the similarities between descriptions of the fights against the Hungarians and the book of Maccabees. He concluded that Widukind used the Jews' last stand as a basis to elevate the Saxons above any other nation. They became new (this time successful) Maccabees. He also noted the possibility that it was written in reference to Liudolf's rebellion and was meant to strengthen the dynasty after that conflict. The popularity of this part of Bible in Ottonian Germany is well attested.⁷² Widukind was not the only one who used the Maccabees in a connection with fights against pagans. The descriptions of their wars were sometimes seen in other texts, as an exemplary history in the context of the heathens' attacks.⁷³ Later they were used as examples for the crusaders in their fights against the Muslims. It is clear that this anti-pagan sentiment, visible in the Bible, is also found here in Widukind.⁷⁴ Other sources – Liudprand and Adalbert – both built an elevated image of the dynasty, but based it on different concepts. While Liudprand quoted the books of the Maccabees, he did that in a different place and context.⁷⁵

Keller has noted that the victory over the Hungarians was a means for chroniclers to mark God's mercy for the new dynasty. By this, it was shown that the Liudolfings were close to Lord and their actions were appreciated.⁷⁶ This opinion is reinforced by the lack of any mention of Arnulf of Bavaria's victories over the Hungarians in 909 and 910 in *Antapodosis*. The glory of defeating the heathens was only to belong to the Liudolfings. Similarly, in Widukind, it is only members of the ruling family and Charlemagne who

71 Frutolf, *Chronicon*, p. 182-83.

72 Keller, 'Machabaeorum', p. 417, 428-29, 433, 437.

73 Wittekind, 'Die Makkabäer', p. 49; cf. de Jong, 'The Empire', p. 215-17.

74 Cf. Reeve, 'The Painted Chamber'.

75 *Antapodosis* IV.27, cf. Keller, 'Machabaeorum', p. 430.

76 Keller, 'Machabaeorum', p. 428.

have defeated them. This is different from Adalbert, who mentions that the Hungarians were once defeated by the Bavarians and the Alemans and on another occasion by the Carinthians.⁷⁷ Still, the overall image is similar: the real defenders of the realm were the Ottonians. Of course, these victories were possible only thanks to God's mercy.⁷⁸

In many ways, this description of the tenth century and the idea behind it remained popular among modern historians. They saw Henry's rule as a time of the creation of a new army that 30 years later would defeat the Hungarians at the decisive battle of Lechfeld.⁷⁹ The demand for a larger picture led them to be interested more in the few sentences of Widukind where he described *agrarii milites*, than in the battle itself.⁸⁰ The Saxon king was also seen as a first one who stood against the Hungarian attacks. While some, like Lüdtkke, downplayed the Christian elements of those struggles, they put a great emphasis on the conflict between the Germans and the barbaric people from the east.⁸¹ This notion was very popular in the older scholarship, while more recently, without a doubt because of the World War II, it has been downplayed in serious historical works.⁸² Now more emphasis is put on the peaceful behaviour of Henry and his achievements in state building than on his conquests and wars with foreign enemies.⁸³ To create such an intellectual construction, the defence of the realm against the Hungarian attack is somewhat redefined and included within the concept of *amicitia* pacts. Historians saw proofs of making a pact between king and his people in the documents from the time of Henry's rule, Church councils acts and other sources. Their objective was to create a common cause for a fight against the Hungarians.⁸⁴ While the aim of books and articles which discuss this problem, is to broaden knowledge about the internal affairs of the kingdom, by this it also removes the limelight from Henry's achievements in war, focusing more on his peaceful acts. Nevertheless, Henry is still

77 Regino of Prüm ad 913, 944.

78 Althoff, *Amicitia und pacta*, p. 76-77.

79 Cf. Schoenfeld, 'Freedom', p. 59. About the popular interpretation of the battle of Lechfeld, see Kellner, 'Die Lechfeldschlacht'.

80 Cf. Lintzel, 'Die Schlacht von Riade', p. 106; Cartellieri, *Die Weltstellung*, p. 32-33; Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 87-89. On *milites agrarii*, see Schoenfeld, 'Freedom', p. 59-72; Schoenfeld, 'Anglo-Saxon', p. 53-58, 59-66. Still important is Leyser, 'Henry I'. For a criticism of Leyser's ideas, see Bachrach and Bachrach, 'Saxon Military'. For Henry's other military reforms, see Erdmann, 'Die Burgenordnung'; Büttner, 'Zur Burgenbauordnung'.

81 Cf. Lüdtkke, *König*, p. 101-03, 168-78; cf. Lüdtkke, 'Das deutsche Ostland', p. 16.

82 Cf. Reuter, *Germany*, p. 12-13.

83 Cf. Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 45-48.

84 Althoff, *Amicitia und pacta*, p. 76-77.

presented as a warrior ruler, whose actions were mostly concerned with the sword. But instead of being only a conqueror of the east, he is mainly a creator of the German kingdom.

In the opinion of nineteenth and twentieth century historians, who represented a nationalistic perspective, the fights with the Hungarians had an additional meaning. They were a part of a theme of the defence of Europe against a dangerous and aggressive groups.⁸⁵ The Hungarians fit this concept, as not only were they heathens but they were also famous nomads. Such views were quite clearly based on a much older tradition. In early tenth century texts they are connected to the Apocalypse and similar end-of-times texts. The Hungarians attacked churches and nothing holy was safe from them. For example, in *Casus...* there is a lengthy description of their vicious behaviour during one of their raids on the famous monastery.⁸⁶ There are many examples of their evil acts in Thietmar's *Chronicon*.⁸⁷ Such sources inspired the imagination of the German historians. In the later part of the twentieth century, this image was again downplayed, as a more pacifistic interpretation of history dominated. Yet even now, while the idea of dangerous Hungarians is not as openly proposed as it was in the past, there are scholarly works in which authors repeat these ideas, but without such problematic language.⁸⁸

Waitz, in his description of the Hungarian attacks, goes with Widukind's description. Liudprand is treated as somewhat misguided.⁸⁹ The real battle is Riade. There Waitz, using Widukind, writes that Henry gathered people from all over his kingdom. To describe the campaign Waitz combined information from Widukind and Liudprand's narratives and thus created a detailed account of what happened. This description is therefore rather concrete, without many points leading outside of what is to be found in the sources. For example, there is a lengthy discussion of where Riade was.⁹⁰ Later on, he notes that the successful fights against the Hungarians were the main reason why Henry is remembered.⁹¹

In other history books, there are clearly two ways of understanding the conflict with the Hungarians. One elaborated more about the presumed victory in 924, while the other concentrated completely on Riade. Cartellieri's

85 For example, Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 138.

86 Ekkehard IV, *Casus Sancti Galli* c. 53-54.

87 On their role according to Thietmar, see Thietmar, *Chronik*, II.8.

88 For example Althoff and Keller, *Die Zeit*, p.98-115.

89 Waitz, *Jahrbücher* (1885), p. 77-78

90 Waitz, *Jahrbücher* (1885), p. 150-58

91 Waitz, *Jahrbücher* (1885), p. 255

book is the perfect example of the first: Henry's men during the Hungarian attack of 924 by luck capture one of their commanders and acquire peace for his release. The price is a tribute in money.⁹² The payment is not perceived as a surrender, but a way of gaining time to prepare to fight. Henry is also able to make the western border of his kingdom safe, as he had a free rein there thanks to peace in the East.

For Cartellieri, the balance between East and West was a reoccurring theme of German politics. That the free hand in the West was important, can be seen in the Giselbert's attempt to change sides back to the West Frankish kingdom, but it was thwarted by Henry.⁹³ After a few years, in 933, when the Hungarians attacked, Cartellieri, following Liudprand, notes that Italy was not as lucky as its northern neighbour who avoided civil wars and conflicts, and therefore was more prepared for the attack. As for the battle itself, Henry sends light Swabian troops and afterwards heavily armoured warriors. After the battle the Hungarians did not attack Saxony or Thuringia during Henry's lifetime, but they invaded southern Germany in 935. It is clear from the text that they were afraid to invoke the wrath of the great king, or even emperor, as Cartellieri notes that Henry was made an emperor on the battlefield. He writes that Napoleon I has shown that it is action that makes a title, even when it is not acknowledged immediately.⁹⁴ This idea was one of Cartellieri's leitmotifs.

Lüdtke wrote that war with the Hungarians in 933 was for freedom ('Freiheitskampf'). It was a war of the people ('volk') against the invaders. There is a unity of 'Leader and People' ('Führer und Volk'). The fight was not only for Saxony, or Germany, but the whole of Europe. For Lüdtke, Liudprand's text was based on the Saxon song or legend.⁹⁵ The Hungarians were called 'Children of Devil' and were screaming 'Húi! Húi!', but Lüdtke did not mention that the scream was derived from Liudprand.⁹⁶ At first, it seems that he only recollected Widukind's narrative, but then he used Liudprand to make the description more interesting and detailed.⁹⁷ At the outcome of the battle the Hungarians do not dare to attack again. It is a glorious victory for the German people and their leader.

92 Cartellieri, *Die Weltstellung*, p. 23-24.

93 Cartellieri, *Die Weltstellung*, p. 24-27.

94 Cartellieri, *Die Weltstellung*, p. 39-40.

95 Lüdtke, *König*, p. 168-71.

96 'Kinder des Teufels' (a translation of 'filius Belial' from Theodorus Monachus, *Annales Palidenses*, p. 56, 61), Lüdtke, *König*, p. 172.

97 Lüdtke, *König*, p. 173.

Thoss emphasised that the whole of Germany was 'afraid' of 'the wild Hungarian hordes'.⁹⁸ What was most important about these wars was the unification of Germany. The Hungarians could easily have attacked all of Europe and are called evil. Thoss writes more about the place of the battle, than he did about the battle itself. Still, he also wrote that the victory put Europe in a better, safer, position. It was in line with: 451 Battle of the Catalaunian Plains, 732 Tour, and Poitiers, 955 Lechfeld, 1241 Battle of Legnica (Legnitz), and finally 1683 Vienna. Thoss notes that it has always been German soldiers who have protected Europe from its enemies, and just as it did then, now (in 1943) Germans were still fighting for it.⁹⁹

In his book about the Saxons, Holtzmann writes that the mostly overlooked victory against the Hungarian invasion of 913 was achieved not because of Conrad's ability to command, but for other reasons. Mainly, it was achieved through the solidarity of the *Stämme*: Bavaria and Swabia. They attacked the Hungarians after they were returning from their plunder of Turingia, Franconia, Swabia, and Lotharingia. To prove this, Holtzmann wrote that Conrad was unable to stop the later Hungarian attack which took place in 917.¹⁰⁰

After Henry began his reign, everything changed. The victory at Riade was achieved thanks to his strength and his power was so great that the Hungarians never dared to attack again during his lifetime. Thanks to this victory, the German duchies were united under Henry's reign. It was such a great victory, that afterwards there could be no thought about kingdom being divided. Instead, Germany as a whole was made.¹⁰¹

Diwald devotes a lot of space in his book to describing the Hungarian danger, not only their attacks on Germany, but also their activities in Italy. There was no force able to stop them. If the reader was not already enough informed about their activities, Diwald also quoted the description of the attack on the Saint Gall monastery from *Casus....* There is also a description of how Henry made a truce with the Hungarians, which he needed to strengthen his kingdom.¹⁰²

In his account of the before and after of the battle of Riade, he generally followed Widukind, he also discussed the localisation of Riade. Next, he made lengthy quote from Liudprand, which includes Henry's poem-speech. Some information, like the King's personal participation in battle, is taken from Widukind. The victory is accounted a great success. While in the battle of

98 'Schrecken [...] der wilden ungarischen Scharen', Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 132.

99 Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 132, 134, 136-38.

100 Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 62, 65.

101 Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 94-96.

102 Diwald, *Heinrich*, p. 373-75, 377-91.

Lechfeld the Hungarians were finally defeated, it goes without saying that Riade was an important – founding – step in that direction. This victory united the whole Reich.¹⁰³

Jakob Vogel's epic *Vngrische Schlacht* was so popular that it became a basis for a folk song.¹⁰⁴ Riade was part of a series of great triumphs against non-European enemies. Diwald lists the 451 Battle of the Catalaunian Plains, 732 Tour, and Poitiers, the Battle of Legnitz with a wrong date – 1281 instead of 1241 – and finally 1683 Vienna.¹⁰⁵ The careful reader will immediately notice that this is almost the same list, as Thoss'.

In Giese's examination of Riade, he saw in Henry's orders, as they are described in *Antapodosis*, a realistic example of military tactics used in a battle. On the other hand, he doubted the King's rejection of simony.¹⁰⁶ His account of the later battle was based on Widukind's text. Only the scream of 'Húi, húi' by the Hungarians is taken from Liudprand. For Giese, Henry was a great hero, leader, commander, and a great victor. This at least emerges from his narrative. From *Antapodosis*, he notes that there was a painting made to commemorate victory. He doubts that Henry was made emperor at the battlefield, arguing that this would be a reference to the ancient times, and not to reality.¹⁰⁷

When discussing Althoff's book, it could be noted that he accepted the claim of rejection of simony as trustworthy.¹⁰⁸ The victory at Riade was important in creating a sense of unity in the kingdom, but overall, he was not very interested in describing battle.¹⁰⁹ This was also the case in his later book.¹¹⁰ He was definitely more concerned about the *agrarii milites*, than with the conflict.¹¹¹

2 Battle of Lechfeld, The End of Hungarian Attacks

This is not the end of how the Hungarians were used by Liudprand to create the appropriate image of Otto. While Riade was Henry's great victory, it was not the end of the Hungarians' attacks – that was battle at Lechfeld, which Liudprand never described. Still, he was aware of it and expressed

¹⁰³ Diwald, *Heinrich*, p. 483-94.

¹⁰⁴ Diwald, *Heinrich*, p. 490; Jakob Vogel, *Vngrische Schlacht*, III.11.

¹⁰⁵ Diwald, *Heinrich*, p. 491.

¹⁰⁶ Giese, *Heinrich*, p. 109, 111.

¹⁰⁷ Giese, *Heinrich*, p. 117-19.

¹⁰⁸ Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 63.

¹⁰⁹ Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 64-65.

¹¹⁰ Althoff and Keller, *Die Zeit*, p. 136.

¹¹¹ Althoff and Keller, *Die Zeit*, p. 132.

its importance. At the beginning of his chronicle, he includes a chapter where he enumerates kings and rulers of Europe. There he stated that the Hungarians at that time (that is the late ninth century) were unknown because they were blocked by the 'closures', but at the time he wrote his chronicle, all nations had learned about them and their brutal and vicious acts. Such information sets a tone for all his mentions of the Hungarians, but Liudprand immediately add that those people 'now does not dare even to whisper'. This is because 'the most holy and unconquered king' Otto defeated them and made them renounce their lifestyle of looting and raids.¹¹² Liudprand writes that he will describe how it happened with details at a later time. This is quite obviously a reference to the Lechfeld battle. He never wrote more about it, yet his work addressed the battle at the beginning. This shows that, as the first book of *Antapodosis* was written in late 50s of the tenth century, Lechfeld had very quickly became part of what, broadly speaking, was royal propaganda.

In such a context, in Liudprand's chronicle Riade should be seen as a prophecy of the future victories over the Hungarians. It also shows that the Liudolfings were a chosen dynasty: the only ones who were able to defeat these nomads and therefore provide peace for Europe. This construction should be connected to the role of the Lechfeld battle in *Res Gestae*. There it works as a repetition of Henry's victories. At the same time there are victories over Slavs which are also described. By combining these two conflicts, Widukind confirmed the dynasty's power. This is strengthened by the role these battles have in the narrative. They are clearly a high point of the whole chronicle. It is after the victory at Lechfeld, that Otto is finally – just like Henry – called an emperor.¹¹³ While there is some speculation over the meaning of this act, without doubt for Widukind it was Otto's greatest victory.¹¹⁴

The idea of the empire, visible in Widukind's work, was derived from the Anglo-Saxon understanding that the emperor was a ruler who controlled the smaller kingdoms. Such a view was not baseless. Straight after the account of the battle of Riade, there is a description of how Henry worked as a peacemaker in France between the King and one of his vassals. Thus, Widukind showed that Western kingdom was also under the Saxons' dominance.¹¹⁵

112 'Sanctissimi atque invictissimi regis [...] muttire non audet', *Antapodosis* I.5; Squatriti, p. 47.

113 Keller, 'Widukinds', p. 399.

114 Cf. Keller, 'Widukinds', p. 400.

115 Widukind I.39.

The second influence over Widukind was a deep-rooted in a Germanic traditional charismatic style of rule, where a true reign comes from acclamation.¹¹⁶ In this way both battles become crowning events for Henry and Otto. Such views were expanded in the case of the latter, because Widukind, according to scholars, created an opposition between the exclamation of Otto as emperor in the aftermath of the Lechfeld battle and the Roman coronation in 962. Widukind was seen as a critic of Rome. His elision of the ceremony in 962 was seen as an attack on the Roman Imperial title.¹¹⁷ This view is surprisingly widely held and there are many examples of historians expressing it even today.¹¹⁸

This non-Roman emperor would be a composite creation of various traditions.¹¹⁹ This was connected to a victory in battle and to Otto's military success proving that he was able to hold the Imperial title.¹²⁰

3 The Hungarians as Enemies of Civilization

The battles against the Hungarians were important for later generations. While generally Lechfeld overshadows everything else, Henry's victory was also revered. It has already been noted that more nationalistic oriented historians saw Otto as a traitor to his father's legacy. Lechfeld is the point where even those who are highly critical of him have praised his achievement, because these nomads could easily be called an epitome of the whole 'barbaric' East. They were used interchangeably with the Huns, that is, as a byword for a nation which endangers the West. In some sort of twisted mirror, the Germans were also called the Huns from the late nineteenth century onwards, based on the famous *Hun Speech* by Wilhelm II, in which he expressed the opinion that German Soldiers who went to stop the Boxer rebellion were to make a name for themselves, just as the Huns did under Attila. Such an association was also present during the First World War, where 'the Czechoslovakians' were oppressed by the 'Teuton Huns' and 'Magyar Huns'. There are also numerous other examples of war propaganda where such connection have been underscored. Even before that, in France

116 Bagge, *Kings*, p. 39-40.

117 Beumann, *Widukind*, p. 259; Epperlein, 'Über'.

118 Ehlers, *Die Entstehung*, p. 80-82; Fried, *Otto III. und Boleslaw Chrobry*, p. 143.

119 Beumann, *Widukind*, p. 229-30. Cf. Lintzel, 'Die Kaiserpolitik Ottos', p. 172-74; Lintzel, 'Das abendländische Kaisertum', p. 136-41.

120 Bowlus, *The Battle*, p. 4.

the Germans were often seen as barbarians. The dangerous Huns and the evil East was also seen during the Cold War.¹²¹

A German author could refer to the Hungarians, the real Huns, but also the Slavs, as a specific nation when using this name.¹²² Therefore, it is not strange that this victory was seen as Otto's redeeming act.¹²³ In creating the East as an enemy, not only the Hungarians became Huns. Poles also became a barbaric nation lacking any good quality. This creation is especially interesting as at the same time, in the nineteenth century, there was sympathy towards them and their struggle to regain liberty, something seen in both poetry and people's actions.¹²⁴ Nevertheless, the view of the eastern neighbour as evil was taking root and more and more texts during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries expressed such a sentiment.¹²⁵

Still, while being the driving force behind the Lechfeld victory, Otto remained controversial for historians of a more nationalistic orientation, who could not forgive him his move towards the south instead of moving to conquer the Slavs. Contrary opinions highlight Otto's Lechfeld victory and conviction about his role in the creation of Austria (the plan for its occupation in 1938 was known as Plan Otto).¹²⁶ Actually, there is more, as during the preparation of the invasion on USSR there were two battle plans: Plan Barbarossa and Plan Otto.¹²⁷

All the views and interpretations which are presented above were not limited to the battle of Lechfeld. Henry's victory over the Hungarians was also placed in a great lineage of fights between a civilised West and a barbaric East. Here historians actually became victims of the relations between Germany and the Slavs, who were synonymous with the Eastern peril. The importance of this division and conflict grew in times of crisis. For

121 Silagi, 'Die Ungarnstürme', p. 259-61; Sösemann, 'Die sog. Hunnenrede'; Muth, *Command Culture*, p. 29-30; Glant, 'The War for Wilson's Ear', p. 27; cf. Johnston, 'Pro-German', p. 104; Marquis, 'Words as Weapons', p. 486; Pietz, 'The "Post-Colonialism"', p. 72 note 12; Serrier, "Barbaren aus dem Osten", p. 69-75.

122 Cf. Helzel, *Ein König*, p. 77-78, 95.

123 In Hungarian chronicles, Lechfeld was also seen as marking an end of the nomadic period; Silagi, 'Die Ungarnstürme', p. 265-66. Alberic of Trois-Fontaines, a thirteenth century Cistercian chronicler, supposedly using Hungarian sources, wrote that seven men who survived the battle after return to their homeland put everyone there into servitude; *Albrici monachi Triumfontium Chronicon* ad 957; on this see Csákó, 'Les Éléments Fabuleux', p. 6-8

124 See Majewski, 'Sage nie', p. 29-40. At the same time there was some criticism of Poles which later took the upper hand, see Liulevicius, *The German Myth*, p. 72-78.

125 Helzel, *Ein König*, p. 75-98.

126 There is a lingering suspicion that the name came from crown prince Otto Habsburg, but this is rather unconvincing, see Helzel, *Notiz zu Hitlers militärischer Weisung*.

127 Cf. Helzel, *Himmlers und Hitlers Symbolpolitik*, p. 41-43.

example, under the Nazi regime there was a great push to make Henry a great hero, mainly because of his victories over the Hungarians and Slavs. To strengthen the effect the depiction of these victories would have on the readers, Lüdtke wrote about the 'Hungarized State of Huns'.¹²⁸ Henry was not alone in such a transformation into a hero of Western civilisation. Similar to this was the fate of Henry the Pious, the *Dux* of Silesia from the Polish Piast dynasty, who became a Great German defender from the Eastern menace in the form of the Mongolian invasion.¹²⁹ These authors present Germany in such a way, that it could be called *Antemurale Christianitatis*, or rather *Europae*. Such views were especially strong at the time of the campaign against the USSR. Keeping all of this in mind, it becomes clear that in this ideological structure, the battle of Riade emerges as a very important victory. It was placed among the greatest victories of the Saxons on their eastern borders.¹³⁰ This propagandistic association of Henry with the victories in the east is exemplified by how at the beginning of World War II, after only three days of fighting had passed, a special train was sent by the Germans to the conquered regions of Poland. It was part of the Himmler's *Ostpolitik* and the name of the train is *Heinrich*, without a doubt a reference to Henry.¹³¹ At the same time, in other places the war against the Hungarians has been compared to the wars against France during the Napoleonic Era. In such a concept, the victory over these heathens was a creation of the Germans as a nation and this was followed later on with wars of the nineteenth century.¹³²

Similar to the *Antemurale...* line of thinking was also followed by, for example, Holtzmann, who saw Riade as an important step in the making of the German nation. The Christian and nationalistic elements of Henry's rule were self-complementary and Holtzmann called the King a warrior of two causes: religious and nationalistic. The battle was itself the first clash of the new unified Germany against the heathen barbarians. By the victory of the Germans, not the Saxons, he saw a sign of a bright future that was yet to come under Otto's rule.¹³³ As has been noted, he was not alone in such an understanding of the past. Riade was noted by Lintzel as Henry's first act representing the whole Reich, and not only Saxony.¹³⁴ This was a reply to the question he himself asked: what was the importance of the battle,

128 'Magyarische Hunnentum', Lüdtke, *König*, p. 83.

129 Cf. Cetwiński, 'Apoteoza klęski', p. 158-61.

130 Helzel, *Ein König*.

131 Helzel, *Ein König*, p. 12.

132 Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 134; Lüdtke, *König*, p. 177.

133 Holtzmann, *Kaiser*, p. 20-21, cf. Helzel, *Ein König*, p. 245.

134 Lintzel, 'Die Schlacht von Riade', p. 107.

when the Hungarians remained a threat.¹³⁵ This battle was the beginning of Germany as a unity. Before this there were only Saxons, Bavarians etc. Afterwards there was one nation.¹³⁶ This vision is also present in *Bildersaal...*, where Riade – presented as one of Henry's most important achievements – is noted as a battle where he had the whole Reich behind him. This was the mark of his success as at first he was supported only by Saxons and Franks. It led to the creation of Germany.¹³⁷

This battle was additionally used as an example of the change in the style of reign from Conrad's to Henry's. Lintzel argued that the Saxon king created a more powerful centralized rule thanks to it. Conrad was fighting the *Stämme* with the help of the Church which led to a situation where most of the people were placing their sympathies with his enemies. For Conrad, this conflict was a way to strengthen his position and rule, but he failed. On the other hand, by uniting the duchies around his person in the wars with the Hungarians, Henry achieved Conrad's aim and did it with the sympathy of his subjects. Lintzel noted that this was the time, something not so frequently seen in the history of Germany, that the whole kingdom, from the Alps to Denmark, was unquestionable united behind their king.¹³⁸

For some Henry's greatest achievement was to begin the colonization of the East. This was quite obviously in line with the whole political concept that the place of Germany is in the East and not in the South. Therefore, the first king who began the expansion of the kingdom in that direction, was a hero. This view is explicitly stated by Cartellieri.¹³⁹ Setting eyes on the East was important in Hitler's regime.¹⁴⁰ There the *Wild East* became the medieval variation of the *Wild West*, known to many Germans from Karl May's books.¹⁴¹ This idea, an element of the infamous 'Drang nach Osten', that dominated German politics and the perception of it, does not have a basis in either Liudprand or Widukind. In fact, it is to a large extent contradictory with these sources which emphasised the defensive nature of the struggles with Germany's Eastern enemies. This does not mean that there was no plan for the conquest of Slavic territories, but it was far from later nineteenth and twentieth century concepts, even though it was used in part to legitimise Germany's aggressive stance.

¹³⁵ Lintzel, 'Die Schlacht von Riade', p. 101-02.

¹³⁶ Cf. Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 95-96.

¹³⁷ Bär and Quensel, *Bildersaal*, p. 50, 52.

¹³⁸ Lintzel, 'Die Schlacht von Riade', p. 110-11.

¹³⁹ Cartellieri, *Die Weltstellung*, p. 49.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Mazower, *Hitlers Imperium*, p. 170-71.

¹⁴¹ Helzel, *Ein König*, p. 111-22.

In some ways, in German public view Henry was a second Arminus/Hermann of the Teutoburg Forest. Just as Hermann was used to show the victory of the Germans against the West – Rome here was mixed with France – Henry crushed the East, that is the Slavs and the Hungarians.¹⁴²

Of course, not everyone saw the wars against the Hungarians as an all-German fight against pagan enemies,¹⁴³ but this was a dominant view (like Josef Fleckenstein's sentiment that the battle against the Hungarians was a fight of all Germans and a final confirmation of Henry's royal status).¹⁴⁴

Such views are quite obviously dangerous in today's post-World War II Germany and therefore these impressions were downplayed. When Henry's reign was discussed, the wars against the Hungarians were overshadowed by his internal affairs. Good examples of these changes are the lexicon entries about Henry, varying by year of publication. While in the first half of the twentieth century his most important acts are joining Lotharingia and his victories over the Slavs and the Hungarians, in the newer lexicons the stress is on his relations with the *duces*.¹⁴⁵

Nevertheless, in some historical studies, especially popular histories, these concepts of a Germany born on the battlefield still appear, but more in connection with Lechfeld, than with Riade.¹⁴⁶ Henry's great victory is overshadowed by Otto's. It is seen in textbooks and in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*.¹⁴⁷ A recent documentary film about Otto begins with the battle of Lechfeld, and not without reason. This victory is the mark of the greatness of the king as a defender from the danger of the heathens.¹⁴⁸ This follows the traditional interpretation of the battle as a turning point. It marked a new beginning, where the Germans stood in defence of the whole of Europe.¹⁴⁹ This is a clear change from the early twentieth century, when it was Riade that inspired many and was one of the few events of the tenth century which was known to common people.¹⁵⁰ There are some who think that both Riade and Lechfeld were instrumental in safeguarding the existence of the future Germany.¹⁵¹

142 Helzel, *Ein König*, p. 56; on Teutoburg Forest and Riade, see Mosse, *Die Nationalisierung*, p. 94.

143 Cf. Schultze, 'Die sächsischen', p. 262-63, 266-68; Helzel, *Ein König*, p. 71.

144 Fleckenstein, 'Das Reich', p. 231, Helzel, *Ein König*, p. 73.

145 Helzel, *Ein König*, p. 44-45.

146 Kellner, 'Die Lechfeldschlacht', p. 293-94.

147 Compare Althoff and Keller, *Die Zeit*, p. 136-37 and p. 200-02. On *Lexikon* see Lübke, 'Riade'; Karpf, 'Lechfeld, Schlacht auf dem'.

148 *Otto und das Reich*.

149 Holtzmann, *Kaiser*, p. 64-65.

150 Lintzel, 'Die Schlacht von Riade', p. 92.

151 Bowlus, *The Battle*, p. 168.

It seems that for the whole generations of the German historians the battle against the Hungarians constituted the Liudolfing dynasty as the first rulers of the Reich. This vision came from Liudprand and Widukind. Even though there was rarely any thought of questioning the narratives and the reasons for their constructions, the historical myth was preserved.

Liudprand was treated by historians as a serious and reliable source for the whole Hungarian affair. There are exceptions, but it seems that overall his whole construction was taken for granted. Cartellieri's book is a good example. When he wrote about the wars with heathens fought during Henry's reign, he noted one important thing: that Germany was happy to have a stable rule compared to Italy. The description of this kingdom is taken from *Antapodosis*.¹⁵²

152 Cartellieri, *Die Weltstellung*, p. 37-39; cf. Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 99-102.

6 The Holy Lance

A Symbol of Empire¹

While Liudprand represented Otto as a great ruler, chosen by God and standing above any other ruler, there was one more element that made him a true emperor. This was a relic, which had a specific meaning. It was a combination of various traditions connected to Moses and the Passion, and this object would make its owner into an emperor. This is the Holy Lance.² Its importance for German historiography was so great, that it is impossible to even note all existing scholarship on it.³ I will concentrate on the descriptions in *Antapodosis* and *Res Gestae*. Later traditions about the Lance are a subject that should have a separate study.⁴ In Liudprand's

1 Earlier version of this chapter was read at International Medieval Congress in 2015 in a session *Texts and Politics in the Long Tenth Century* organised by Levi Roach.

2 This Holy Lance is not the only one in existence; Hofmeister, *Die heilige Lanze*, p. 70-72. According to the later tradition, Æthelstan was given the Lance of Longinus from Charlemagne's treasury by Hugh Capet, William of Malmesbury; *De gestis regum*, II.135; Ortenbeg, 'The King', p. 222-23; Czapelska, 'Aethelstan', p. 162-64. There were also some who thought that the Lance in the German kingdom came from Æthelstan, cf. Ortenbeg, 'The King', p. 235.

Symptomatic of the misunderstandings about the Lance is the twelfth century *Annales Zwifaltenses*. In the entry for the year 1032, the Holy Lance was once in the possession of Constantine, and was then acquired by Rudolph II, King of Burgundy, from the Italian Count Samson, and later, after the King's death, it was sent to Emperor Conrad II. See also Loomis, 'The Holy Relics'. Liudprand's Lance is connected to the Lance of Saint Maurice, the Lance of Longinus and the Lance of Constantine, Hofmeister, *Die heilige Lanze*, p. 54-64, 78-83.

3 Among the most important are Hofmeister, *Die heilige Lanze*; Klewitz, 'Die heilige Lanze'; Holtzmann, *König*; Schramm, 'Die "Heilige Lanze"'; Schulze-Dörrlamm, 'Die Heilige Lanze'. Valuable still is de Mély, 'Reliques'. On the Holy Lance in Cracow see Dalewski, 'Die Heilige Lanze'.

The Lance in Cracow was mentioned by Gallus Anonymous in his chronicle: '[A]s a triumphal banner he gave him as a gift one of the nails from the cross of our Lord with the lance of Saint Maurice' ('pro vexillo triumphali clavum ei de cruce Domini cum lancea sancti Mauritij dono dedit'), *Galli Anonymi Cronica*, I.6; Knoll and Schaer, p. 37; Przemysław Wiszewski argues that this and the *vexillum* noted in the inventory of the Wawel Cathedral's treasury were not the copies of the Holy Lance; Wiszewski, *Domus Boleslai*, p. 411-12. This is something of a contradictory statement as in the same place Wiszewski identified the Lance with Gallus' *vexillum* and then saw it as two different objects that were probably held in Gniezno. Not to mention that Gallus explained that *vexillum* consists of a nail from the True Cross and the Mauritius Lance.

4 The role and importance of the Lance in later times is seen in Bruno of Querfurt's letter to Henry II, where he castigated him for waging war against Boleslav Chrobry and questioned the German king's alliance with pagans writing: '[I]n what way devil Swarożyc and *Dux* of saints, your and ours Maurice, agree? With what forehead are united holy lance and diabolical

chronicle there is a long description of how Henry acquired the Lance. Its theological meaning is explained. A whole group of chapters devoted to this object are located between the narratives about the civil war. It is some sort of intermezzo that has been added to strengthen Otto's positive image. This is why Liudprand brakes the chronology and describes Henry's actions in the section about the events that took place long after his death.

It begins with how Henry acquired the Lance.⁵ Liudprand wrote that it was in the hands of King Rudolph of Burgundy, who ruled Italy for some time and got it from count Samson.⁶ When Henry hears about this object, he makes it known that he wants to have it. The Saxon king was a 'God-fearing man and a lover of all things religious'. Therefore, he sends messengers to Burgundy asking for it and offering Rudolph whatever he would like in return. But he is rejected. Thus, Henry goes with his army to force Rudolph into giving it up. The Saxon threatens that the whole of Burgundy will fall, and everyone who lives there will be slain and burned. Therefore, Rudolph decides to give up and hands over the Lance, as Liudprand writes: '[W]hat was right to the righteous king who was rightly seeking it'.⁷ Both kings become friends afterwards and Henry gives Rudolph a part of Swabia and many other precious gifts as compensation.

Liudprand also includes a description of the Lance. This is somewhat remarkable, as otherwise he never wrote much about objects. It was different from other lances. It has a 'novel style and also a new elaboration of shape, having openings on both sides of the flank section: in front of the thumb pieces, two very beautiful blades extended up to the middle slope of the lance' and 'it has crosses made from the nails driven through the hands and feet of our Lord and Redeemer Jesus Christ at its mid-point, which above I

banners which are feed human blood' and it is implied that under this banner 'christian head [...] is sacrificed' ('quo modo conueniunt Zuarasiz diabolus et dux sanctorum, uester et noster Mauritius? qua fronte coeunt sacra lancea et qui pascuntur humano sanguine diabolica uexilla?', 'christianum caput [...] inmolatur sub (*) demonum uexillo?'); Bruno of Querfurt, *Epistola ad Henricum*, p. 101-02; on the letter see Pleszczyński, *The Birth of a Stereotype*, p. 155-56; cf. Blough, 'The Lance', p. 340-41; Warner, 'Saints, Pagans, War', p. 27; Wiszewski wrongly saw the letter as an expression of a lack of veneration of Wawel's copy of the Lance; Wiszewski, *Domus Boleslai*, p. 416. For a survey of the later traditions about the Holy Lance, see Adelson, 'The Holy Lance'.

5 *Antapodosis* IV.25; cf. Oberste, 'Heilige und ihre Reliquien', p. 77-79. On p. 81-82 Jörg Oberste notes that the Lance is similar to the hand of Saint Dionysius (Widukind I.33), a relic of friendship.

6 On Samson, see Hofmeister, *Die heilige Lanze*, p.18-21.

7 'Dei timens totiusque religionis amator [...] iustoque regi iusta iuste petenti', *Antapodosis* IV.25; Squatriti, p. 158.

called the flank'.⁸ This description and its details, even though the veracity of it is questioned, shows how important it was for Liudprand.⁹

The nail from the True Cross is at the centre of the description. The reason for this is clear as 'they claim' the Lance was in the possession of Constantine the Great, the son of Saint Helena who discovered the relics of the Cross.¹⁰ It must be added here, as Barbara Baert has written, that 'the discovery of the Cross means the "founding" of a Christian empire under imperial patronage'.¹¹ It made what Liudprand later called 'a most invincible weapon against, and eternal triumph over, visible and invisible enemies'.¹²

Liudprand consequently wrote about the two types of enemies fighting against Otto. On one side, there were material ones – rebels and the Hungarians – but on the other, there was the invisible one: the Devil. This makes the Lance a powerful symbol that is tested during Otto's reign. It is also clear that Liudprand centred his whole description of the rebellion against Otto on the Lance. A victory giving weapon.

But why was the nail important and the reference to the Cross so underlined? The strong use of the symbol of the Cross in battles has already been noted. This includes Emperor Heraclius, who was supposed to have a spear with a part of the Cross inside it during an expedition against the Persians in 622.¹³ An even better comparison is Constantine, who put nails from

8 'Novo quodam modo novaque elaborata figura, habens iuxta lumbum medium utrobique fenestras: hae pro pollicibus perpulcræ duæ acies usque ad declivum medium lanceæ extenduntur [...] quæ media in spina, quam lumbum superius nominavi, ex clavis manibus pediibusque domini et redemptoris nostri Iesu Christi adfixis cruces habet', *Antapodosis* IV.25; Squatriti, p. 157-58.

9 Some expressed the view that the Holy Lance – now in the possession of Hofburg Palace in Vienna – did not fit Liudprand's description and even saw Wawel's as the one that was closer to it in description; Hofmeister, *Die heilige Lanze*, p. 46-50; cf. Schramm, 'Die "Heilige Lanze"', p. 529 note 5. Schramm was of the opinion that Liudprand's description, while different from the Lance held in Vienna, is still reliable. On p. 533-34 he suggested how the typical Lombard lance became a Holy one in Liudprand's description. The presumed nail from the Passion was a normal part of the lance and not a relic. Cf. Adelson, 'The Holy Lance', p. 181 note 34; Holtzmann, *König*, p. 7-8. On the Vienna Holy Lance see Mehofer, Leusch, and Bühler, 'Archäometallurgische'.

10 'Hanc igitur [...] fuisse adfirmant', *Antapodosis* IV.25; Squatriti, p. 158.

11 Baert, *A Heritage*, p. 72

12 'Adversus visibiles atque invisibiles hostes arma invictissima triumphumque perpetuum', *Antapodosis* IV.25; Squatriti, p. 158; cf. William of Malmesbury, *De gestis regum*, II.135.

13 Mergiali-Sahas, 'Byzantine Emperors', p. 50; on Heraclius' wars against Persia and True Cross, see Frolow, 'La Vraie Croix'; cf. Baert, *A Heritage*, p. 133-93.

the Cross in his helmet and the harness of his horse¹⁴, and in his sword.¹⁵ Through such stories, relics of the Cross were strictly connected with the Byzantine emperor.¹⁶ Berent Schweinöcker has written that Liudprand, in his description of the Lance, was inspired by Byzantine traditions. The Ottonian Lance was given elements and ideology of the Cross and infused with the Longinus Lance (which also could have been in the possession of the Eastern emperor).¹⁷ It is vital to see that the connection of the Holy Lance with the nail from the Cross does not appear in other sources from Ottonian times. For some, Liudprand's description is much more rooted in Italian traditions.¹⁸

Liudprand used the symbols of the Empire, but it is difficult to say whether it was a clear translation of the Eastern symbol, or maybe it had some root in the Western traditions. Some have proposed that the connection between the Lance and Saint Helena was from Constantinople.¹⁹ Still, in the west the tradition of her discovering the Cross was popular.²⁰ It seems also that

14 Mergiali-Sahas, 'Byzantine Emperors', p. 49; about the popularity of this information in Italy in the tenth century, see Holtzmann, *König*, p. 16 and especially note 37 there.

According to Adémar of Chabannes, there was wood from the True Cross in Charlemagne's crown; Ademar of Cabannensis, *Chronicon*, II.25; Bojcov, 'Der Heilige Kranz', p. 59.

15 William of Malmesbury, *De gestis regum*, II.135.

16 Mergiali-Sahas, 'Byzantine Emperors', p. 48; cf. Fichtenau, 'Zum Reliquienwesen', p. 78-79.

17 Schweinöcker, 'Christus-Reliquien-Verehrung', p. 208-09. Josef Deér wrote that the Lance as a symbol of the ruler was taken from Byzantium. On Byzantine use of the Lance, see Deér, 'Byzanz', p. 427-30.

18 Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft*, p. 56-57.

19 Koder, 'Byzanz', p. 246-47.

20 Rufinus Aquileiensis, *Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, I.7-8 – in editions including Rufinus' translation of Eusebius of Caesarea's work this is book X; Rufinus of Aquileia, *The Church History*, p. 45, note 14; on the importance of Rufinus as the main source about Constantine in the West, see Christensen, *Rufinus of Aquileia*, p. 10.

Ambrosius Mediolanensis, *De Obitu Theodosii*, c. 43-48. Cf. Ambrose of Milan, *Ambrose of Milan*, p. 175-77. Harbus, *Helena of Britain*, p. 28-51. On Ambrose's text see Bojcov, 'Der Heilige Kranz'. On the origin of the legend about Helena see Drijvers, 'Promoting Jerusalem'. The story of finding the True Cross is also in Cynewulf, *Elene*. On the Cross in the Carolingian empire, see Baert, *A Heritage*, p. 54-80.

From the vast amount of Carolingian material it is worth mentioning the story from *Annals of Fulda*: In 887 Charles the Fat sent to Arnulf the relic of the Cross upon which the latter swore fidelity. As he was then attempting a coup d'état, it was an important symbol of his breaking his oath. Simon MacLean wrote that Charles held part of the Cross in a reliquary described in *Casus...* It was made in the shape of a chapel and be a form of 'legitimacy in a box'; MacLean, *Kingship and Politics*, p. 156-58 (quote p. 157); Meginhardus, *Annalium Fuldensium*, ad 887; Ekkehard IV, *Casus Sancti Galli* 10.

As Garrison noted, there is a late eighth century richly decorated manuscript containing a version of the story about finding the True Cross; Clm 22053; Garrison, 'Letters', p. 309 note 14. On the manuscript see Bierbrauer, *Die vorkarolingischen*, p. 83-84 (entry 155).

memory of her was strong in the Ottonian kingdom, as in 952 her relics – Liudprand's 'holy British mother' – were translated from the convent of her name in Hautvillers to Trier.²¹

The connection of Otto and Constantine is important here. This clearly was Liudprand's aim. The man who Christianised the Roman empire was an important Christian hero and was linked with Imperial Glory.²² This was thus read and understood by the author of *Vita Gerardi abbatis Broniensis*, who based his description of the civil war on *Antapodosis* and called the Lance 'labarum' which is a name used to denote Constantine's banner from the Battle of Milvian Bridge.²³

For Liudprand, Henry's gifts/compensation to Rudolph for the Lance are important. For God what was important was the intention and not what was given. So, while Henry gives many precious things, it is his mind and spirit which is greater. This is why the Almighty gives him so many victories. It is not his virtue that is important, or the strength of his soldiers, but the Lance, a 'victory-bringing symbol' which was in front of the army.²⁴ The same was with Otto, who inherited the Lance together with the kingdom and in *Antapodosis* it became in a way a symbol for the *regnum*.²⁵

If such elevated words were not sufficient, chronicler adds that it was not only the threats which moved Rudolph to surrender the Lance, as Henry sought the 'gift by which God united the heavenly and earthly, that is, the keystone that makes one out of two'.²⁶ Jesus Christ makes the friendship between Rudolph and Henry possible. Here the Lance is an object uniting heaven and earth. There are other examples of such weapon-objects of such power, like the lance of Julius Caesar that was to become a memory of him, as a creator of the Wolin. There is also the *stanitia* of Świętowit (Svetovid) in Arkona.²⁷ All these weapon-objects were providers of the legitimization and proof of God's providence. Those who held the *stanitia* of Świętowit could, as law bringers, even destroy villages and temples. These objects that

21 'Sancta Britannica mater', *Antapodosis* I.26; Squatriti, p. 62. Baert, *A Heritage*, p. 108-09.

22 Hofmeister, *Die heilige Lanze*, p. 22-23; Ermoldus Nigellus, *In honorem Hludowici*, line 425; *Gesta Berengarii*, IV line 150 and Appendix II. On Constantine in the medieval imagination see Graf, *Roma*, 2, p. 46-120.

23 *Vita Gerardi abbatis Broniensis*, c. 14

24 'Victorifero [...] signo', *Antapodosis* IV.25; Squatriti, p. 158.

25 Cf. Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft*, p. 57 note 178; cf. Schramm, 'Die "Heilige Lanze"', p. 527-28.

26 'Munus erat quo caelestibus terrea Deus coniunxerat, lapis scilicet angularis faciens utraque unum', *Antapodosis* IV.25; Squatriti, p. 158.

27 *S. Ottonis Episcopi Babenbergensis Vita Prieflingensis*, II.5-6; Saxo Grammaticus, XIV.39.15. Lubor Niederle proposed that the author of Otto's life made a mistake in seeing a lance in this object; Niederle, *Slovanské starožitnosti*, p. 203-04; cf. Dynda, 'The Three-Headed', p. 61-62.

are god's – whether Christian or heathen – united *sacrum* with *regnum*.²⁸ There is also a 'rod of virtues' in the Mainzer *Ordo* which is a symbol of justice and order enforced by the king.²⁹ Finally there is the lance which Jesus Christ used to defeat the Hungarians who attacked Modena in 899.³⁰

After this Liudprand makes a further digression, this time about doubting Thomas. In his interpretation, the Apostle's action was made under divine providence. Touching resurrected Christ was a proof for those who doubted in the materiality of the risen. Later Liudprand explained the meaning of this reference by addressing the King directly. As the King had smaller army than his enemies at Birten, then his victory was given by God. This was a way for the Almighty to show great esteem for the King, who wins the battle 'by praying'.³¹ This is followed with a remark that by this victory God wanted to show Otto his greatness, as saints know about their status only after they are tested, like Abraham, who was prohibited from sacrificing his own son. Similarly, Liudprand used Saint Peter and his renunciation of Christ, combined with a further exclamation of his love of God, to show the importance of being tested.³²

According to the chronicler, God is aware that no matter who was stronger in battle, even if Otto had the larger army, he would still say that it was his Maker's victory. He is a true believer. Birten happens in such a way not because of Otto's faith, but to show God's power to others, to show that the strength of an army is nothing compared to His will. Through Otto's deeds, God wanted to strengthen the faithful and at the same time show that the King was someone special.

Widukind's chronicle has a different image of the Lance, where it appears more than once. It first appears as part of the regalia given by Conrad to Henry.³³ The second appearance of the Lance is during the battle of Lechfeld. The great Hungarian attack of 954 becomes Otto's greatest victory. After the battle has raged on for some time, Otto decides to strike the final blow against his enemies. He makes a great speech to motivate his soldiers,

28 Banaszkiewicz, 'Czym była', p. 62-64.

29 'Virga virtutis', *Mainzer Ordo*, c. 21.

30 This is noted in the so-called *Song of the Watchmen of Modena*, line 30 (*Carmina Mutinensia* I), Blough, 'The Lance', p. 347-48. Karen Blough has suggested that this lance could be the one Samson gave Rudolph. Neil Christie saw the *Song* as an example of holy defence of the city and pointed at *Antapodosis* III.5-6 (Christie has wrongly II) as another example of such a construction; Christie, *From Constantine*, p. 163-64.

31 'Orando', *Antapodosis* IV.26; Squatriti, p. 160.

32 Cf. Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft*, p. 61-62.

33 Widukind I.25.

saying that he has never lost when he had their help and bravery. While the enemy is more numerous, it is not stronger in valour and weapons. Nevertheless, God's favour is the greatest advantage of the Saxons. Otto adds that it would be shameful, if the rulers of the whole of Europe were defeated and states that it would be better to die in battle, than to be slaves or be executed. Therefore, after he has implored his soldiers to fight with the enemy he takes his shield and the Lance and mounts a horse, attacking the Hungarians.³⁴ In Widukind's text, the Lance became a weapon used in a fight against the pagan hordes.

While for both authors it is a part of the signs of the kingdom and the King, each of them presents it in different way. Liudprand is much more interested in its history and meaning. He also describes what the Lance was, what it looked like. Widukind saw it as a part of the regalia and a weapon used in a fight against the heathens.³⁵ While the Lance, it seems, was a symbol of the rule in the kingdom of Italy, Liudprand never alludes to this.³⁶

It has been mentioned that at Birten Otto was depicted as a new Moses and the Lance was used to that effect. The idea that the ruler was a new Moses was popular.³⁷ He was one of the Old Testament heroes used as a role model for kings. Examples of this are in Byzantium, where he (together with David and Joshua, son of Nun) was an exemplary model for Byzantine emperors.³⁸ Moses was also an important figure in Byzantine and Late Roman art connected with the Imperial rule. He was set in line with the Emperor Constantine. On a sarcophagus from the fourth century there

34 Widukind II.46; Adolf Hofmeister notes other examples of the use of the Lance on the battlefield from later times; see Hofmeister, *Die heilige Lanze*, p. 27 note 2.

35 Holtzmann argued that in Widukind's chronicle the Lance was more of a symbol of power, than a relic. Holtzmann, *König*, p. 59-60; cf. Hofmeister, *Die heilige Lanze*, p. 26-27.

36 Holtzmann, *König*, p. 14-15; Klewitz, 'Die heilige Lanze', p. 48; de Mély, 'Reliques', p. 293-94. In Lombard Italy the lance was an important sign of power not only used symbolically during the election of the new king – as in the name of the gathering (*gairthinx* – assembly of the lances), but also in the ritual as the new king received a lance; Gasparri, 'Kingship', p. 98-101. On Byzantine use of the Lance see Deér, 'Byzanz', p. 427-30.

Important to understand the role of the Lance is a story from the late eighth century *Passio Mercurii*: The Roman Emperor Decius (a pagan) fights with barbarians. One of his soldiers, a Christian named Mercurius Philopator is given a special lance by an angel to fight the pagans, but he is also told to remember about God. After Decius' victory in which Mercurius shows his heroism and killed the barbarian king there is to be a sacrifice to the heathen gods. Mercurius refuses to participate in it and is promptly martyred. Ian N. Wood has written about how this Greek saint was changed into a Lombard one. The Lance is in: Arechis, *Passio Sancti Mercurii*, lectio IV; on the manuscript and story see: Wood, 'Giovardi'.

37 Biliarsky, 'Old Testament', p. 267.

38 Rapp, 'Old Testament', p. 196.

is a clear parallel outlined between the two, with Moses crossing the Red Sea and Constantine defeating Maxentius at the Milvian bridge. A similar image is present in texts about Constantine (such as *Historia Ecclesiastica* and *Life of Constantine* by Eusebius of Caesarea).³⁹ The reference extends to the story of the Pharaoh drowning in Red Sea.⁴⁰ There is also often an interpretation of the figures of Moses and Aaron as symbolizing the emperor and the patriarch in both pre- and post-iconoclasm art.⁴¹ This led to the idea that becoming another Moses made another Constantine of a ruler.⁴²

The use of Moses as a reference for rulers was not limited to the East. There are many examples of such interpretation in the West, such as in letters sent by several popes to Pepin the Short.⁴³ First Zachary, and then Stephen II called him a new Moses (and David).⁴⁴ Also in *Annales Petaviani* Charlemagne is compared to Moses and the conquest of Bavaria with the killing of the Pharaoh during the crossing of the Red Sea.⁴⁵

39 Grabar, *L'empereur*, p. 95-96, 236-37; Van Dam, *Remembering*, p. 71-72, 86-87. About sarcophagi see Noga-Banai, 'The Sarcophagus'; cf. Schmidt, 'X.42 Fragmente'; Rapp, 'Old Testament', p. 183; Rapp, 'Imperial Ideology'; Dagron, *Emperor*, p. 98; Whatley, 'The Figure', p. 192-96.

In Sedulius Scottus, *Liber de rectoribus Christianis*, c. 15 there is a list of victories acquired through prayer. It begins with a battle against Amalekites and Constantine is also mentioned as one who won over his enemies because he took the Cross for a banner. Cf. Staubach, *Rex christianus*, p. 134-35.

There is also a possible reference to Moses in the Arch of Constantine's depiction of the battle at Milvian Bridge; Habas, 'The Imperial Sculpture', p. 53-54. There is also a certain similarity between Liudprand's 'did not lack divine inspiration' ('non sine divino instinctu', Antapodosis IV.24, Squatriti, p. 157) and 'instinctu divinitatis' appearing on the Arch of Constantine, but there is nothing to mark it as anything more than a coincidence; Hauck, 'Erzbischof Adalbert', p. 312 note 141.

The Arch of Constantine and its meaning is a complicated affair. There is evidence to see it not as a Christian object, but as a completely pagan one, including the use of the phrase 'instinctu divinitatis', which according to Noel Lenski fits pagan imagination and language more than Christian; Lenski, 'Evoking the Pagan Past', especially p. 226-31.

40 Van Dam, *Remembering*, p. 80.

41 Grabar, *L'empereur*, p. 96, 176; Dagron, *Emperor*, p. 109-10; Brubaker, *Vision and Meaning*, p. 217-21, especially p. 221.

42 Rapp, 'Old Testament', p. 182-83.

43 Enright, *Iona*, p. 129-30.

44 *Codex Carolinus*, no 3, 11; cf on *Codex Carolinus*, Garrison, 'The Franks', p. 123-29

45 *Annales Petaviani* ad 788. I thank Robert Evans for informing me about this. On the entry, see Garrison, 'The Franks', p. 152-53. Cathuulf in his letter similarly compared Charlemagne directly to Moses crossing the Red Sea by the expression: 'likewise in Moses "God fights for us"' ('item in Moyse: "Deus pugnat pro nobis)'), *Epistolae variorum Carolo Magno*, no. 7, p. 502; translation from Garrison, 'The Franks', p. 146. On the letter see Garrison, 'Letters', especially p. 307-12. See also the letter to Tassilo discussed by Mary Garrison, where the battle of Rephedim

Liudprand clearly saw the Lance as not only a reference to the Passion, but also to the Rod of Moses in the way in which it was used. Hauck has noted that the *virga Moysi* was one of the relics that was of high importance in Byzantium and it seems that for him Liudprand transferred its legitimizing power to the Lance in order to strengthen Otto's position.⁴⁶

In early Christianity the Rod of Moses was of considerable importance and was held in great esteem. Origen wrote that it was the Cross.⁴⁷ In the Byzantine Empire it was a relic treated on the same level of respect as those of the Passion. It was connected to the chaplain's reign over people.⁴⁸ It has also been claimed that Constantine Porphyrogenitus included it in *pledges of reign* (*pignora imperii*).⁴⁹ In *De Caeremoniis* there are other references to the Rod: during the feasts of Easter, Pentecost, Transfiguration, Christmas, and Epiphany the emperor was to hold the Cross of Constantine the Great and the *virga Moysi*.⁵⁰ It was (in Liudprand's times) to be held in the oratory of Saint Theodore in Chrysotriklinos.⁵¹

The connection between the Cross and Moses' Rod went further, as seen in the Armenian chronicle written by Lewond (Lewond/Ghewond), where during the siege of Constantinople Emperor Leo III warns his Muslim enemies that they should not provoke God, because He can do to their armies the same that he did to Pharaoh at the Red Sea. Lewond emphasises that it took place through Moses and the Rod, which was a model for the Cross. The Rod was used as a weapon to make the waters of Red Sea attack the Pharaoh's army. When the Muslim forces arrive, a great procession is made

is directly referenced in a long list of Old Testament triumphs which ends with the victory at Milvian Bridge; *Epistolae variorum Carolo Magno* 1, p. 496-97.

46 Hauck, 'Erzbischof Adalbert', p. 305-07.

47 Origenes, *Homiliae in Exodum*, IV.6; cf. Habas, 'The Imperial Sculpture', p. 53. It is worth adding that the figures of Christ and Moses were seen as being highly connected in late ancient Christianity. Cf. Rapp, 'Imperial Ideology', p. 693-94.

48 Tycner-Wolicka, *Opowieść*, p. 146.

49 Alexander, 'The Strength of Empire', p. 343; Biliarsky, 'Old Testament', p. 267. *Pignora imperii* were symbols of Roman power linked to its survival. See generally, Buxton and Kleiner, 'Pledges of Empire', p. 63-65; Hartmann, *Zwischen Relikt und Reliquie*, p. 545-62.

50 Mergiali-Sahas, 'Byzantine Emperors', p. 55. They could also be held before the emperor, see Featherstone, 'Space and Ceremony', p. 602; there is also a question how often such rituals were staged and to what extent the descriptions correspond to reality; Featherstone, 'Space and Ceremony', p. 605-06.

51 Together with other *virga*, Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Cerimoniis*, II.40; cf. Magdalino, 'Observations', p. 58; Klein, 'Sacred Relics', p. 92-93. On Chrysotriklinos, see among many, Featherstone, 'The Chrysotriklinos'. Liudprand should have seen Chrysotriklinos during his mission to Constantinople. It was a place of many important rituals, feasts and discussions with the embassies. See Featherstone, 'The Great Palace', p. 51-53, 56.

around the city with the Emperor holding a cross. The procession climaxes with a three time cry for help to God, making a sign of the cross over water and finally placing the cross that was in Emperor's hands in the water. The effect is the expected destruction of a greater part of the Muslim army.⁵²

All of this led to the idea that the Lance was introduced into the narrative by Liudprand to mark Otto as a future emperor.⁵³ Körntgen disagreed with this; for him there are no details in Liudprand's description that could lead to such an impression. He was more of the opinion that in the story the important element was not a typology *rex* – Moses, *rex* – Christ, but Christ – Lance. In the Lance he saw an element of the creation of Otto and his father as rulers chosen by God. Körntgen highlighted the element of the Lance connected with Christ's Passion, which thus gave the Ottonians a special connection to the Almighty.⁵⁴

I think that Körntgen was wrong to limit the meaning of the Lance. The examples and lines of thoughts presented above, make it clear that Liudprand made it an object of many meanings. It was a *virga Moysi* and it was a relic of the Passion, and at the same time a relic of Constantine. Through the Lance Otto became another Constantine, and at the same time he was made another Moses.⁵⁵ As the meaning of Constantine and Moses is almost the same, it is safe to say that Liudprand made Otto a great hero of Christianity, an emperor.

In later sources there was an evolution of the story of Lance. An account of its origin appears in a shortened version in Frutolf's *Chronicle*.⁵⁶ The narrative is in correct chronological order. The description of how it was acquired is put between Henry's contacts with Charles the Simple and the Hungarian attack described by Liudprand. This explains a change he made to his account of Henry's coronation. While Frutolf copied Widukind's version, one word is missing in the list of regalia that were to be transferred to the new King: instead of *Res Gestae's* 'holy lance' (depending on the manuscript either 'lancea sacra' or 'sacra lancea') there is 'lancea scilicet' – 'of course the lance'.⁵⁷ This shows a certain amount of criticism toward the sources. Annalista Saxo lacked this when he repeated Widukind's version verbatim.⁵⁸

52 Ghevond, *History*, c. 20; Cecota, *Arabskie oblężenia*, p. 143-46; on the historical and ideological concepts of Łewond, see Martin-Hisard, 'L'empire byzantin', especially par. 23-28; cf. Humphreys, *Law, Power*, p. 83; Magdalino, 'The Other Image', p. 144.

53 Karpf, *Herrscherlegitimation*, p. 30-31; Hauck, 'Erzbischof Adalbert', p. 304-05, 313-14.

54 Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft*, p. 56-58.

55 Holtzmann, *König*, p. 15.

56 Frutolf, *Chronicon*, p. 182.

57 Widukin I.25, Bachrach, p. 38; Frutolf, *Chronicon*, p. 180.

58 Annalista Saxo ad 919.

His decision is important because later he repeated Frutolf's account of Henry acquiring the Lance and put it in an entry in his chronicle for a date of 925.⁵⁹ Therefore, in his text Henry acquired the Lance from Rudolph even though he got it prior to this from Eberhard.

Remaining with Frutolf, in his description of the Birten battle, he not only quotes a large part of Liudprand's text about the Amalekites and that Otto was weeping in front of all the people, but also that in front of them was the Lance 'in which there was a victorious nail, (which) wounded hands and feet of our Saviour'.⁶⁰ The Lance appears later in a quotation from Widukind about the Lechfeld battle.⁶¹

Most of the textbooks which have been discussed either ignore, or confirm that the Holy Lance was connected to the Passion of Christ.⁶² Only rarely is there outright disagreement with this idea. Still, there are some major differences in the exact descriptions. The biggest one is found in Thoss' book. For him it was clear, as Henry received the Lance with his regalia, that it was not Constantine's, but a traditional Germanic lance – Wodan's – a thousand year old German symbol of rule.⁶³ For Thoss, the story about how Rudolph gave the Lance to Henry was an anecdote, with an element of truth: Rudolph gave up to Henry his control over northern Italy and the Imperial title.⁶⁴

For other authors, even when they mention the Lance, it is not a very important object. In Waitz's book, he describes how this relic became an Ottonian possession and one of the signs of Henry's reign. Nevertheless, there was one thing he could not believe and this was Liudprand's statement that Henry gave Rudolph some land in exchange for it. Waitz rejected this idea and instead connected the Lance to the marriage between Rudolph and Burchard of Swabia's daughter, Berta.⁶⁵ Both Köpke and Dümmler noted the Lance, but only in a passing reference. Following Widukind, they wrote that Otto moved to fight the Hungarians at Lechfeld while holding the Lance.⁶⁶

The remainder concentrated on the political aspect of the Lance. Cartellieri, by identifying it with Constantine's lance, saw it as a symbol of

59 Annalista Saxo ad 925.

60 'In qua victoriosi clavi, manibus pedibusque Redemptoris nostri affixi, erant, inclusi...', Frutolf, *Chronicon*, p. 185.

61 Frutolf, *Chronicon*, p. 189.

62 Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 83-84; Cartellieri, *Die Weltstellung*, p. 21; Lüdtkke, *König*, p. 87; Holtzmann, *Kaiser*, p. 22; Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 103; Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 52-53; Laudage, *Otto*, p. 339; Giese, *Heinrich*, p. 122-23.

63 Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 79-80.

64 Thoss, *Heinrich* (1943), p. 167.

65 Waitz, *Jahrbücher* (1885), p. 66-67.

66 Dümmler and Köpke, *Kaiser*, p. 258.

domination over Italy.⁶⁷ Lüdtkke wrote after Widukind that the Lance was among the regalia taken by Eberhard, but later on discussed how it was acquired by Otto's father from the hands of Rudolph. Lüdtkke noted that it was among the most precious treasures of the kingdom. He named the Lance as Constantine's. Rudolph was forced to give it to Henry and while he got Basel in exchange, it was in fact already in his hands.⁶⁸ A similarly brief account is in Günter's book. There it is only noted that Rudolph gave Henry the Lance. There is no description of how it looked like, or what its meaning was. Even the information about the gift is short and without any details.⁶⁹

The same is the case in Althoff's book, for whom the Lance was a rather uninteresting object. He only noted that Henry got it from Rudolph, that it contained nails from the Passion and that later it became the most important, victorious, relic of the whole Ottonian dynasty.⁷⁰ Laudage almost followed these footsteps, appearing to note only that Otto took it to the wars.⁷¹ But there is more about it in his description attached to the photograph of the Lance printed in the book. Laudage explains that it was a very important relic, which had a nail from the Cross and that Otto had it during the Lechfeld battle.⁷²

On the other hand, the Lance has an important place in Holtzmann's biography, where Otto takes it on campaigns, but the historian sets this in the context of him being a collector of relics.⁷³ There is a description of how the Lance looked and how it came into the possession of German kings. It came from Rudolph of Burgundy and it was in connection with Henry's plans of southern expansion. Holtzmann emphasized that the Lance was a symbol of domination over Italy and of Imperial rule.⁷⁴

In *Geschichte...* the Lance is mentioned many times as a symbol of Imperial rule. These are just passing references that mark its importance, but do not provide detailed information. Still, when he wrote about the relations between Henry and Rudolph, Holtzmann paid attention to describing one particular gift given by the latter to the former: the Lance. Its description is taken from Liudprand's text, together with the story of how the nail from the Cross was given by Helena to Constantine. There is also a note that Henry

67 Cartellieri, *Die Weltstellung*, p. 30.

68 Lüdtkke, *König*, p. 76, 87.

69 Günter, *Kaiser*, p. 18.

70 Althoff, *Die Ottonen*, p. 52.

71 Laudage, *Otto*, p. 34.

72 Laudage, *Otto*, p. 339.

73 Holtzmann, *Kaiser*, p. 140.

74 Holtzmann, *Kaiser*, p. 22.

gave gold and silver and a part of Swabia for the Lance. Here Holtzmann also informs his readers that Basel was already in Rudolph's possession since 912. Henry, as a good German, would never surrender German lands, but instead made peace and streamlined the borders.⁷⁵ What is interesting here are religious undertones. There is no mention of Wodan or any of such pagan ideas, instead it is strongly emphasised that the Lance was a relic of Christ's passion. This fits the overall pro-Christian tone of the book.

Diwald followed Liudprand's description of how the Lance came to the Ottonians. He even began this sub-chapter of his book with a description of battle of Birten. He noted the legend about Longinus and later on Maurice's lance, but what is more important, he reminded his readers about Wodan's Lance. In his view it was an example of a very long and old tradition that predated Christianity. The inclusion of the Lance in the regalia translated by Eberhard was a proof for him, as it obviously was not the same Lance as the one used in Birten and therefore implied that the one in the regalia had to be Germanic. Writing that the Lance symbolised rule over Italy, Diwald also noted that it was also a symbol of Imperial rule. It might have even been behind the campaigns in Italy, that eventually bound both kingdoms for next few hundred years in a struggle.⁷⁶

Giese based his description of how the Holy Lance came to Henry on Liudprand's text. There is a basic narrative and also the information how Rudolph was repaid by Henry with Basel when it was already in his possession. Nevertheless, there are things that mark Giese's book as a different from the rest. He points out that Liudprand never noted that the Lance was in any way connected to the reign over Italy. Giese actually proposed a different interpretation of the reason why Henry was so keen on acquiring this relic. It was an element of his preparation to fight against the Hungarians. Such a powerful symbol would be fitting in the struggle with them. Giese adds that in later times the Lance was known as Longinus', because the battle of Riade took place on the feast of this saint.⁷⁷

Therefore, while Liudprand used the Lance as a way of giving Otto an imperial symbol, this was mostly ignored in later works. The search for historical truth allowed those authors to ignore the ideological elements of the narrative. In this they were led astray. The text, which had a specific objective, was misunderstood and thus instead of finding the past, they rather created a convoluted and misguided construction.

⁷⁵ Holtzmann, *Geschichte*, p. 103.

⁷⁶ Diwald, *Heinrich*, p. 504-11.

⁷⁷ Giese, *Heinrich*, p. 123-25.

Conclusions

The material presented here shows that Liudprand was interested in writing a far more different thing than modern historians want to find in the chronicles. He legitimized the Ottonians as future rulers of all of Europe that is in his text an Empire. This was done on many levels. First the dynasty acquired the rule of the kingdom from the hands of great King – Conrad I – and then the rulers were able to bring peace throughout the kingdom. Liudprand writes with an awareness of the broader picture. The East Frankish kingdom and Ottonian achievements are confronted with the failures of other rulers, who are unable to make peace. The same goes with the Hungarian attacks. Liudprand presents them as an Enemy on a European scale. They attack all kingdoms and easily raid them. They are unstoppable both because of their own qualities as well as the weakness of the Europeans. Their fighting between themselves and lack of morality marks the Europeans as sinful and therefore righteously losing against their enemies. The Hungarians are God's scourge, just like the Muslims in Fraxinetum and in Africa. The ability to defeat these enemies marks the Ottonians as the defenders of Europe, Christianity and as such the Emperors of Europe. In a situation where no one else is able to act, they are those who do what is needed. Finally, the emperor needs to have a visible sign of his rule. When *Antapodosis* was written, the Ottonians were mere kings, yet they acted as emperors. Therefore, even if ultimately the Imperial crown was not put on Otto's brow, he would be a real emperor, while rulers of Byzantium were emperors only in name.

This highly ideological approach does not mean that his work should be dismissed as a collection of fables and anecdotes, as scholars have sometimes done. The aim of *Antapodosis* and the way in which it was written does not make it different from other chronicles of the time. When Liudprand's text is compared to Widukind's, the difference is not in the latter being more reliable, or that he wrote facts instead of fables. Both authors wrote what is here called myths. These narratives are influenced by the meanings and signs that shape the story they present. They provide an historical narrative, where the construction of the image is much more important than the facts.

Writing about the Ottonians, when using only one source, or ignoring the parts of the others that do not agree with a scholar's sensibilities, is wrong. Many elements of the past are more connected to the concepts that shaped the mind of the authors of the tenth century than to the reality. *Rex renitens*, *rex pacificus*, and all these motifs that are present in the chronicles. They

are marked and explained here and are shown to be the building blocks of the dynasty's image, that cannot be separated from the narratives. The discussion of what happened in 919 is impossible without reading and acknowledging the role of the *rex renitens* motif.

There are many literary constructions present in *Antapodosis*. The use of particular motifs ensures that its author will write his narrative in a certain way. This does not mean that he was not free in the writing process. Each time it is his decision to use the motif and decide on the particular way of its execution. Therefore, each author could use different words, provide different details that make up the meaning of the tale, but had to conclude it in a specific way. A good example of how a motif can be used to different ends is the way in which Widukind used *rex renitens* both to glorify Henry I and in other instance to vilify Conrad I. There is, it seems, an attitude that the motifs and themes as building blocks limit authors' independence, but they are just a means of expressing ideas.

This also brings up certain themes that appear in *Antapodosis*. One of the most important, as seen in this book, was Liudprand's Augustinianism. At first it could be interpreted that Liudprand thought that the fate of men is decided and God stands behind everything that took place. This is not an entirely correct attitude. It is difficult to discern between the demands of the narrative meant to show the Ottonians as chosen by God and his own potential theological opinions. What can be said, is that Augustinianism, just like various motifs present throughout the text, was a building blocks of a larger narrative about the king, who was meant to be an emperor.

It also has to be noted that Liudprand's chronicle had a great influence on later medieval historiography, something which has rarely been acknowledged. Through *Antapodosis* Frutolf composed his own narrative on the tenth century. Liudprand's work was the most influential and this was not limited only to Frutolf. His work was the basis for a long historiographical tradition. It is also clear that in his writings Frutolf preferred to use Liudprand over Widukind, in which he stands in stark contrast toward modern historiography.

Overall, the close reading of chronicles from Ottonian times prove that their narratives are very different from what scholars often take them to be. They are vivid and complicated texts that need to be studied closely. Semi-nationalist approach to the chronicles, where Widukind is reliable and others are not, has to stop. Instead, the narratives should be seen as a whole: as complex ideological constructions. Widukind also provides an ideologically driven narrative, in which his tales express his interests.

Sadly, the vision of history in popular books is far from being critical of the sources. For them, Widukind is reliable, while other sources are deemed as unreliable. Of course, that is until their information fits with their author's construction. When sources and modern narratives are compared, the conclusions are rather pessimistic. For modern authors what was written in the tenth century is not important. What is important are their own preconceptions and ideas. It could be claimed that this shows that the Mythology of the Ottonians has died out. Instead, it is clear that modern historians write new myths about the tenth century. With each new book there is a new version of the myth of German beginnings. This is what mythology is, a set of replicating stories about the past. This also shows that myths are alive and well in modern society, but they are in a place that most people would not look for them, mainly because of the negative stigma connected with the name. I have to note that when I began the project which led to writing this book, I did not expect the extent of the disinterest in the medieval narratives present in German scholarship. Like many others, I came to study the Middle Ages with a very high opinion of these works. The research I have done has made me reconsider this admiration and pointed out the many weaknesses of this tradition. Hopefully the problems raised here could in the long run lead to a change in the way sources are treated and instead of fitting them to already prepared narratives, they will be read and discussed in their whole complexity.

It is not that only German historiography is prone to mythologisation. The French, English, or Polish historiography also provides new interpretations of myths that fit the modern sensibilities, often by attempting to find out what did happen in the past. There is a very thin line between seeing two countries as eternal enemies and close friends. Thus, France and Germany, or Germany and Poland, depending on the demand of the moment can either have had a long history of peaceful or even very friendly relations, or could have always been fighting throughout history. Therefore, the approach proposed in this book could be used to discuss other historiographical traditions in the same vein. Such works would greatly help not only to better understand medieval chronicles, but also provide an important insight into the way modern ideas about the past are constructed and spread. Not all texts could serve as a basis for such discussion. It seems that longer narratives would be the best, like for example *Galli Anonymi Cronica*. The text needs to be also of a certain importance for later historiography, as then it is possible to see how each generation has created new myths, trying to recover the real past from the tales of time gone by.

As a final note, there is one problematic element of the German myths. While many things evolved and changed, one is constant. There is no reflection over the subject of how the scholarship created the myths of German nationalism which influenced the National Socialistic ideology. The subject is discussed, some things are explained as false, but this is limited to specific examples, or to works for specialists. The readers of modern books will never learn that the vision of the Middle Ages presented to them shares many common points with the myths that built the official ideology of Third Reich. This does not mean that the modern authors are in any way connected to this ideology. Instead, this is because National Socialistic vision of the past was grounded in the best traditions of German scholarship. While now it is popular to call authors of that period uneducated and ignorant, they were well read and knowledgeable. It does not mean that history has to be written anew. It means that it has to be pointed out that the past, the myth of the past and scholarship together can lead to evil things.

List of Abbreviations

<i>AfK</i>	<i>Archiv für Kulturgeschichte</i>
<i>APH</i>	<i>Acta Poloniae Historica</i>
<i>ASE</i>	<i>Anglo-Saxon England</i>
AQDGM	Ausgewählte Quellen zur Deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters
BCCT	Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition
<i>BfDL</i>	<i>Blätter für Deutsche Landesgeschichte</i>
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Byzantinische Zeitschrift</i>
CSMLT	Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought
CCAM	Corpus Christianorum. Auographa Medii Aevi
CCCM	Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis
CorUP	Cornell University Press
CSB	Corpus Scriptorum Byzantinae
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
CCSL	Copus Christianorum Series Latina
CUAP	Catholic University of America Press
CUP	Cambridge University Press
<i>DAfEM</i>	<i>Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters</i>
<i>EHR</i>	<i>The English Historical Review</i>
<i>EME</i>	<i>Early Medieval Europe</i>
<i>FMSt</i>	<i>Frühmittelalterliche Studien</i>
<i>GH</i>	<i>German History</i>
<i>HJ</i>	<i>Historisches Jahrbuch</i>
<i>HSJ</i>	<i>The Haskins Society Journal: Studies in Medieval History</i>
HPzS	Heidelberger Publikationen zur Slavistik
HS	Historische Studien
HUP	Harvard University Press
<i>HZ</i>	<i>Historische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>JCH</i>	<i>Journal of Contemporary History</i>
<i>JEH</i>	<i>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i>
<i>JMH</i>	<i>Journal of Medieval History</i>
<i>JÖB</i>	<i>Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik</i>
<i>KH</i>	<i>Kwartalnik Historyczny</i>
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LUP	Liverpool University Press
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica
Diplomata	Diplomata Regum et Imperatorum Germaniae
Fontes Iuris	Fontes Iuris Germanici Antiqui in Usum Scholarum Separatim Editi

Fontes	
Iuris GA	Fontes Iuris Germanici Antiqui
SRG	Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum in Usus Scholarum
SRL	Scriptores Rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum
SRM	Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum
Poetae	Poetae Latini Medii Aevi
AA	Auctores Antiquissimi
SRG-NS	Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum, Nova Series
Studien	Studien und Texte
MGM	Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters
MIÖG	<i>Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung</i>
MPH	Monumenta Poloniae Historica
SN	Series Nova
MSuT	Mittellateinische Studien und Texte
MUP	Manchester University Press
OMT	Oxford Medieval Texts
OUP	Oxford University Press
PL	Patrologia Latina, ed. Jacques Paul Migne
PUP	Princeton University Press
RBMAS	Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores
Settimane	Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo
SRH	Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum
SŻ	<i>Studia Źródłoznawcze</i>
TRW	The Transformation of the Roman World
UTP	University of Toronto Press
VuF	Vorträge und Forschungen
WdF	Wege der Forschung
ZBL	<i>Zeitschrift für Bayerische Landesgeschichte</i>
ZFG	<i>Zeitschrift für Geopolitik</i>
ZGO	<i>Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins</i>
ZSSR	<i>Zeitschrift der Savigny Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte</i>
GA	Germanistische Abteilung
KA	Kanonistische Abteilung
Widukind	Widukind of Corvey, <i>Die Sachsengeschichte des Widukind von Korvei</i>
Antapodosis	Liudprandus Cremonensis, <i>Opera Omnia</i> , p. 1-150
Historia	
Otonis	Liudprandus Cremonensis, <i>Opera Omnia</i> , p. 167-83
Relatio	
de legatione	Liudprandus Cremonensis, <i>Opera Omnia</i> , p. 185-218

Bibliography

Manuscripts

- Clm 6388 = Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 6388, <https://bildsuche.digitale-sammlungen.de/index.html?c=viewer&lv=1&bandnummer=bsb00006691&pimage=00006691&suchbegriff=&l=de> (seen 30 November 2017).
- Clm 14510 = Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14510, <http://bildsuche.digitale-sammlungen.de/index.html?c=viewer&bandnummer=bsb00046285> (seen 30 November 2017).
- Clm 22053 = Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 22053, <http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0003/bsb00031771/images/index.html?seite=132> (seen 30 November 2017).
- '*Codex Aureus*', = Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 14000 (*Codex Aureus*), <http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0005/bsb00057171/images/index.html?fp=193.174.98.30&seite=1&pdfseite=> (seen 30 November 2017).
- Sievers, *Tagebuch* 1943 = Wolfram Sievers, 'Tagebuch 1943', HSL Item No.: 1808, <http://nuremberg.law.harvard.edu/documents/1808-wolfram-sieverss-work-journal?q=author:'Wolfram+Sievers'#p.1> (seen 30 November 2017).

Primary Sources

- Ademarus Cabannensis, *Chronicon* = Ademarus Cabannensis, *Chronicon*, ed. Pascale Bourgain, Richard Allen Landes, and Georges Pon, CCCM 129 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999).
- Aelius Donatus, *Donati Ars Maior* = Aelius Donatus, 'Donati Ars Maior', in *Donat et La Tradition de l'enseignement Grammatical: Étude Sur l'Ars Donati et Sa Diffusion (IVe-IXe Siècle) et Édition Critique*, ed. Louis Holtz, Documents, Études et Répertoires / Institut de Recherche et D'histoire des Textes (Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1981), 603–74.
- Agobardus Lugdunensis, *Liber Apologeticus* = Agobardus Lugdunensis, 'Liber Apologeticus pro Filiis Ludovici Pii Imperatoris Adversus Patrem', in *Traditio Catholica Saeculum IX. Annus 840*, PL 104 (Paris, 1864), 307–20.
- Albrici monachi Triumfontium Chronicon* = Alberic of Trois-Fontaines, 'Albrici Monachi Triumfontium Chronicon', in *Chronica Aevi Suevici*, by Georg Heinrich Pertz, ed. Paul Scheffer-Boichorst, MGH Scriptores 23 (Hannover: Hahn, 1874), 631–950.
- Alcuini sive Albini epistolae* = Alcuin, 'Alcuini Sive Albini Epistolae', in *Epistolae Karolini Aevi (II)*, ed. Ernst Dümmler, MGH Epistolae 4 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1895), 1–493.
- Ambrose of Milan, *Ambrose of Milan* = Ambrose of Milan, *Ambrose of Milan Political Letters and Speeches*, trans. John Hugo Wolfgang Gideon Liebeschuetz (Liverpool: LUP, 2005).
- Ambrosius Mediolanensis, *De Obitu Theodosii* = Ambrosius Mediolanensis, 'De Obitu Theodosii', in *Explanatio Symboli, De Sacramentis, De Mysteriis, De Paenitentia, De Excessu Fratrī Satyri, De Obitu Valentiniani, De Obitu Theodosii*, by Ambrosius Mediolanensis, ed. Otto Faller, CSEL 73 (Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1965), 371–401.
- Angelbert, *Versus de bella* = Angelbert, 'Versus de Bella Quae Fuit Acta Fontaneto', in *Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini (II)*, ed. Ernst Dümmler, MGH Poetae 2 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1884), 138–39.
- Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* = Charles Plummer and John Earle, 'Anglo-Saxon Chronicle', in *Two of the Saxon Chronicles. Parallel*, 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952).

- Annales Altahenses maiores* = Wilhelm De Giesebrecht and Edmund L. B. von Oefele, eds., *Annales Altahenses Maiores*, MGH SRG 4 (Hannover: Hahn, 1891).
- Annales Necrologici Prumienses* = Georg Waitz, ed., 'Annales Necrologici Prumienses', in *Supplementa Tomorum I-XII, Pars I*, MGH Scriptores 13 (Hannover: Hahn, 1881), 219–23.
- Annales Petaviani* = Georg Heinrich Pertz, ed., 'Annales Petaviani', in *Annales et Chronica Aevi Carolini*, MGH Scriptores 1 (Hannover: Hahn, 1826), 7, 9, 11, 13, 15–18.
- Annales Regni Francorum* = Friedrich Kurze, ed., *Annales Regni Francorum Inde A. 741 Usque Ad 829, Qui Dicuntur Annales Laurissenses Maiores et Einhardi*, MGH SRG 6 (Hannover: Hahn, 1895).
- Annales Vedastini* = Bernhard von Simson, ed., 'Annales Vedastini', in *Annales Xantenses et Annales Vedastini*, 2, MGH SRG 12 (Hannover-Leipzig: Hahn, 1909), 40–82.
- Annales Zwifaltenses* = O. Abel, ed., 'Annales Zwifaltenses', in *Annales et Chronica Aevi Salici. Vitae Aevi Carolini et Saxonici*, MGH Scriptores 10 (Hannover: Hahn, 1852), 53–64.
- Annalista Saxo* = Annalista Saxo, *Die Reichschronik des Annalista Saxo*, ed. Klaus Nass, MGH Scriptores 37 (Hannover: Hahn, 2006).
- Annalium Fuldensium (continuatio Ratisbonensis)* = Friedrich Kurze, ed., 'Annalium Fuldensium (Continuatio Ratisbonensis)', in *Annales Fuldenses Sive Annales Regni Francorum Orientalis*, MGH SRG 7 (Hannover: Hahn, 1891), 107–31.
- Arechis, Passio Sancti Mercurii* = Arechis, 'Passio Sancti Mercurii Martyris', in *Acta Passionis, et Translationis Sanctorum Martyrum Mercurii Ac XII Fratrum*, ed. Victorius Giovardi (Roma: J. B. a Caporalibus, 1730), 9–31.
- Asser, Life of King Alfred* = Asser, *Life of King Alfred: Together with the Annals of Saint Neots Erroneously Ascribed to Asser*, ed. William Henry Stevenson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1904).
- Astronomus, Vita Hludowici* = Astronomus, 'Vita Hludowici Imperatoris', in *Thegan, die Taten Kaiser Ludwigs. Astronomus, das Leben Kaiser Ludwigs*, ed. Ernst Tremp, MGH SRG 64 (Hannover: Hahn, 1995), 280–555.
- Audradus, Liber Revelationum* = Audradus, 'Liber Revelationum (Fragmenta)', in *O Roma Nobilis. Philologische Untersuchungen aus dem Mittelalter*, ed. Ludwig Traube, Abhandlungen der Philosophisch-Philologische Klasse der Königlichen Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 19 (München: Verlag der k. Akademie, 1891), 378–90.
- Augustine of Hippo, Enarrationes* = Augustine of Hippo, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, ed. Eligius Dekkers and Jean Fraipont, CCSL 38–40 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1956).
- Augustine of Hippo, Epistulae* = Augustine of Hippo, *Epistulae Pars IV (CKXXXV-CCLXX)*, ed. Alois Goldbacher, CSEL 57 (Vindobona – Lipsia: Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, 1911).
- Bede Venerabilis, Historia ecclesiastica* = Bede Venerabilis, *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum* = *Storia Degli Inglesi*, ed. Michael Lapidge, trans. Paolo Chiesa, 1. ed, 1–2, Scrittori Greci e Latini (Roma): [Milano: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla; Mondadori, 2008).
- Benedictio regalis* = Georg Waitz, ed., 'Benedictio Regalis', in *Die Formeln der Deutschen Königs- und der Römischen Kaiser-Krönung vom Zehnten bis zum Zwölften Jahrhundert*, Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften Zu Göttingen: Dieterich, 1872), 91–92.
- Berno of Reichenau, Vita Sancti Udalrici* = Berno of Reichenau, 'Vita Sancti Udalrici', in *S. Brunonis, S. Odilonis Abbatis Cluniacensis, Opera Mnica*, PL 142 (Paris, 1853), 1183–1204.
- Bischoff, 'Ein Osterpredig Liudprands'* = Liudprand of Cremona, 'Ein Osterpredig Liudprands von Cremona', in *Anecdota Novissima: Texte des Vierten bis Sechzehnten Jahrhunderts*, by Bernhard Bischoff, ed. Bernhard Bischoff, Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters 7 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1984), 20–34.
- Boethius, Philosophiae Consolationis* = Boethius, 'Philosophiae Consolationis', in *The Theological Tractates. The Consolation of Philosophy*, by Boethius, trans. S. J. Tester, LCL 74 (London: HUP, 1997), 130–435.

- Breul, ed., *The Cambridge Songs* = Karl Breul, ed., *The Cambridge Songs; a Goliard's Song Book of the nth Century* (Cambridge: CUP, 1915).
- Bruno of Querfurt, *Epistola ad Henricum* = Bruno of Querfurt, 'Epistola Ad Henricum Regem', in *Vita Quinque Fratrum Eremitarum* [Seu] *Vita Uel Passio Benedicti et Iohannis Sociorumque Suorum; Epistola Brunonis Ad Henricum Regem*, ed. Jadwiga Karwasińska, 3, MPH SN 4 (Warszawa: PWN, 1973), 97–106.
- Bulla Aurea Karoli IV.* = Wolfgang D. Fritz, ed., *Bulla Aurea Karoli IV. Imperatoris Anno MCCCLVI Promulgata*; MGH Fontes Iuris 11 (Weimar: Hermann Böhlhaus Nachfolger, 1972).
- Burchard of Worms, *Decretorum Liber Sextus. De Homicidiis* = Burchard of Worms, 'Decretorum Liber Sextus. De Homicidiis', in *Burchardi Vormatiensis Episcopi Opera Omnia*, PL 140 (Paris, 1853), 763–78.
- Byrhtferth of Ramsey, *Vita S. Oswaldi* = Byrhtferth of Ramsey, 'Vita S. Oswaldi', in *The Lives of St Oswald and St Ecgbwine*, ed. and trans. Michael Lapidge, OMT (Oxford: OUP, 2009), 2–203.
- Caesar of Heisterbach, *Dialogus* = Caesarius von Heisterbach, *Dialogus Miraculorum. Dialog Über die Wunder*, trans. N. Nösges and H. Schneider, 4 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009).
- Capitulatio de partibus Saxoniae* = Alfred Boretius, ed., 'Capitulatio de Partibus Saxoniae', in *Capitularia Regum Francorum*, MGH Leges 1 (Hannover: Hahn, 1883), 68–70.
- Carmen in victoriam Pisanorum* = Herbert Edward John Cowdrey, ed., 'Carmen in Victoriam Pisanorum', *EHR* 92, no. 362 (1977): 23–29.
- Carmina Mutinensia* = Ludwig Traube, ed., 'Carmina Mutinensia', in *Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini* (III), MGH Poetae 2 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1896), 702–6.
- Chronicarum quae dicuntur Fredegarii* = Fredegarius, 'Chronicarum Quae Dicuntur Fredegarii Scholastici Libri IV. Cum Continuationibus', in *Fredegarii et Aliorum Chronica. Vitae Sanctorum*, ed. Bruno Krusch, MGH SRM 2 (Hannover: Hahn, 1888), 1–193.
- Chronicon Salernitanum* = Ulla Westerbergh, *Chronicon Salernitanum. A Critical Edition with Studies on Literary and Historical Sources and on Language* (Stockholm: Almqvist och Wiksell, 1956).
- Cicero, *In Catilinam* = Cicero, 'In Catilinam', in *Cicero X*, by Cicero, trans. C. Macdonald, LCL 324 (London: HUP, 1996), 2–165.
- Codex Carolinus* = Wilhelm Gundlach, ed., 'Codex Carolinus', in *Epistolae Merowingici et Karolini Aevi* (I), MGH Epistolae 3 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1892), 469–657.
- Constantinus Porphyrogenitus, *De Cerimoniis* = Constantinus Porphyrogenitus, *De Cerimoniis Aulae Byzantinae*, ed. J. Reiske, 1 (Bonn: Weber, 1829).
- Cornelius Nepos, *Atticus* = Cornelius Nepos, 'Atticus', in *Cornelii Nepotis Vitae Cum Fragmentis*, ed. Peter K. Marshall (Leipzig: BSB B.C. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1977), 89–101.
- Cornelius Nepos, *Cornelii Nepotis Vitae* = *Cornelii Nepotis Vitae Cum Fragmentis*, ed. Peter K. Marshall (Leipzig: BSB B.C. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1977).
- Cosmas of Prague, *Chronica Boemorum* = Cosmas of Prague, *Chronica Boemorum*, ed. Bertold Bretholz, MGH SRG-NS 2 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1923).
- Cynwulf, *Elene* = Cynwulf, 'Elene. The Finding of the True Cross', in *The Old English Poems of Cynwulf*, ed. and trans. Robert E. Bjork, *Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library* 23 (Cambridge: Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library, 2013), 141–235.
- Das Hildebrandlied* = Hartmut Broszinski, ed., *Das Hildebrandlied: Faksimile der Kasseler Handschrift Mit Einer Einführung von Hartmut Broszinski* (Kassel: J. Stauda, 1985).
- Das Ludwigslied* = Wilhelm Braune, ed., 'Das Ludwigslied', in *Althochdeutsches Lesebuch* (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1875), 143–44.
- De S. Avito Eremita* = Godefrid Henschenius et al., eds., 'De S. Avito Eremita (Vita Ex Duobus MSS. Sarlatensibus)', in *Acta Sanctorum: Ed. Novissima*, 24 (Parisiis&Romae: V. Palmé, 1867), 292–94.
- Deshusses, ed., *Le sacramentaire grégorien* = Jean Deshusses, ed., *Le sacramentaire grégorien: ses principales formes d'après les plus anciens manuscrits*, 3 (Fribourg, Suisse, 1992).

- Die Quirinalien des Metellus von Tegernsee* = Peter Christian Jacobsen, *Die Quirinalien des Metellus von Tegernsee: Untersuchungen zur Dichtkunst und Kritische Textausgabe*, MSuT 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1965).
- Dietrichs Flucht* = Elisabeth Lienert and Gertrud Beck, eds., *Dietrichs Flucht: Textgeschichtliche Ausgabe*, Texte und Studien zur mittelhochdeutschen Heldenepik 1 (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 2003).
- Diplomata Ludowici Germanici = Paul Kehr, ed., 'Diplomata Ludowici Germanici', in *Ludowici Germanici, Karlomanni, Ludowici Junioris Diplomata*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica Diplomata Regum Germaniae Ex Stirpe Karolinorum 1 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1934), 1–284.
- Diplome Otto I* = Theodor Sickel, ed., 'Diplome Otto I', in *Conradi I. Heinrici I. et Ottonis I. Diplomata*, MGH Diplomata 1 (Hannover: Hahn, 1879), 80–638.
- Dudo, *History* = Dudo, *History of the Normans*, trans. Eric Christiansen (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1998).
- Dudo of St. Quentin, *De moribus* = Dudo of St. Quentin, *De Moribus et Actis Primorum Normanniæ Ducum*, ed. Jules Lair, Mémoires de La Société des Antiquaires de Normandie 23 (Caen: F. le Blanc-Hardel, 1865).
- Dümmler, *Gesta Berengarii* = Ernst Dümmler, *Gesta Berengarii Imperatoris: Beiträge zur Geschichte Italiens im Anfänge des Zehnten Jahrhunderts* (Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1871).
- Eadmer of Canterbury, *Vita Dunstani* = Eadmer of Canterbury, 'Vita Dunstani', in *Eadmer of Canterbury: Lives and Miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan, and Oswald*, by Eadmer of Canterbury, trans. Bernard J. Muir and Andrew J. Turner, OMT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006), 44–158.
- Einhard, *Vita Karoli* = Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni*, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz and Georg Waitz, MGH SRG 25 (Hannover – Leipzig: Hahn, 1911).
- Ekkehard IV, *Casus Sancti Galli* = St. Galler Klostergeschichten, 4., gegenüber der 3. um eine Nachtrag erweiterte Auflage, AQDGM 10 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1991).
- Epistolae variorum Carolo Magno* = 'Epistolae Variorum Carolo Magno Regnante Scriptae', in *Epistolae Karolini Aevi (II)*, ed. Ernst Dümmler, MGH Epistolae 4 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1895), 494–567.
- Epistula Reginonis* = Regino of Prüm, 'Epistula Reginonis Ad Hathonem Archiepiscopum Missa (in Reginonis Abbatis Prumiensis', in *Reginonis Abbatis Prumiensis Chronicon Cum Continuatione Treverensi*, ed. Frederick Kurze, MGH SRG 50 (Hannover: Hahn, 1890), XIX–XX.
- Ermoldus Nigellus, *In Honorem Hludowici* = Ermoldus Nigellus, 'In Honorem Hludowici', in *Poème sur Louis le Pieux Suivi de Epîtres au roi Pépin*, ed. Edmond Faral, Les Classiques de l'Histoire de France Au Moyen Age 14 (Paris, 1932), 1–201.
- Frutolf and Eccardus, *Chronicles* = Frutolf and Eccardus, *Chronicles of the Investiture Contest: Frutolf of Michelsberg and His Continuator*, trans. Thomas John Henry McCarthy (Manchester: MUP, 2014).
- Frutolf, *Chronicon* = Ekkehard of Aura and Frutolf of Michelsberg, 'Chronicon Universale', in *Chronica et Annales Aevi Salici*, ed. Georg Waitz, MGH Scriptores 6 (Hannover: Hahn, 1844), 1–267.
- Galli Anonymi Cronica* = Gallus Anonymus, *Galli Anonymi Cronica et Gesta Ducum Sive Principum Polonorum*, ed. Karol Maleczyński, MPH SN 2 (Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1952).
- Gebehardus episcopus Augustensis, *Vita (II) S. Uodalrici* = Gebehardus episcopus Augustensis, 'Vita (II) S. Uodalrici (BHLnr.8361)', in *Mittelateinische Studien*, by Walter Berschin, ed. Walter Berschin (Heidelberg: Mattes, 2005), 255–66.
- Gerbert, ed., 'Benedictio Crucis' = Martin Gerbert, ed., 'Benedictio Crucis', in *Monumenta Veteris Liturgiae Alemannicae*, 2 (St Blassien, 1779), 51–52.
- Gerhard, *Vita S. Udalrici* = Gerhard von Augsburg, *Vita sancti Uodalrici: die älteste Lebensbeschreibung des heiligen Ulrich: lateinisch-deutsch; mit der Kanonisationsurkunde von 993*, ed. Walter Berschin and Häse (Heidelberg: Winter, 1993).

- Gesta Berengarii* = Ernst Dümmler, ed., 'Gesta Berengarii Imperatoris', in *Gesta Berengarii Imperatoris: Beiträge zur Geschichte Italiens im Anfänge des Zehnten Jahrhunderts* (Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1871), 77–133.
- Ghevond, *History*, = Ghevond Yerets, *Ghevond's History*, trans. Robert Bedrosian, Sources of the Armenian Tradition (Long Branch, 2006).
- Giraldus Cambrensis, *De Principis Instructione Liber* = Giraldus Cambrensis, *De Principis Instructione Liber*, ed. George F. Warner, RBMAS 21 (London: Eyre&Spottiswoode, 1891).
- Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum* = Gregory of Tours, *Libri Historiarum X (Gregorii Turonensis Opera. Teil 1)*, ed. Bruno Krusch and Wilhelm Levison, MGH SRM 1 (Hannover: Hahn, 1951).
- Gumpold, *Passio Vencezlai* = Gumpold, 'Passio Vencezlai Martyris', in *Životy svatých a některých jiných osob nábožných*, ed. Josef Emler, Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum 1 (Praha: Museum Království českého, 1873), 146–66.
- Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum* = Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum: The History of the English People*, trans. Diana E. Greenway, OMT 53 (Oxford: Clarendon Press/OUP, 1996).
- Hincmar of Reims, *Admonitio ad episcopos* = Hincmar of Reims, 'Admonitio Ad Episcopos et Ad Regem Carolomannum apud Sparnacum Facta', in *Fürstenspiegel des Frühen und Hohen Mittelalters*, ed. Hans Hubert Anton, AQDGM 45 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2006), 193–205.
- Hincmar of Reims, *De ordine palatii* = Hincmar of Reims, *De ordine palatii*, ed. Thomas Gross and Rudolf Schieffer, MGH Fontes iuris 3 (Hannover, Hahn, 1980).
- Hincmar of Reims, *De regis persona* = Hincmar of Reims, 'De Regis Persona et Regio Ministerio Ad Carolum Calvum Regem', in *Hincmari Rhemensis Archiepiscopi Opera Omnia*, PL 125 (Paris, 1852), 833–56.
- Historia Translationis s. Viti* = Georg Heinrich Pertz, ed., 'Historia Translationis S. Viti', in *Scriptores Rerum Sangallensium. Annales, Chronica et Historiae Aevi Carolini*, MGH Scriptores 2 (Hannover: Hahn, 1829), 576–85.
- Hohenaltheim 20. September 916* = Ernst-Dieter Hehl and Horst Fuhrmann, eds., 'Hohenaltheim 20. September 916', in *Die Konzilien Deutschlands und Reichsitaliens, 916–1001*, MGH Concilia 6 (Hannover: Hahn, 1987), 1–40.
- Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: A Florilegium* = Hrotsvit of Gandersheim, *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: A Florilegium of Her Works*, ed. Katharina M. Wilson, Library of Medieval Women (Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 1998).
- Hrotsvit, *Gesta Ottonis* = Hrotsvit of Gandersheim, 'Gesta Ottonis', in *Hrosvithae Opera*, ed. Paul von Winterfeld, MGH SRG 34 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1902), 201–28.
- Il Chronicon di Benedetto* = Benedict of Sant'Andrea, *Il Chronicon di Benedetto, monaco di S. Andrea del Soratte e il "Libellus de Imperatoria Potestate in Urbe Roma*, ed. Giuseppe Zucchetti, Fonti per La Storia d'Italia 55 (Roma: Bottega d'Erasmus, 1920).
- Iohannis VIII. papae epistolae* = E. Caspar and G. Laehr, eds., 'Iohannis VIII. Papae Epistolae Passim Collectae', in *Epistolae Karolini Aevi (V)*, MGH Epistolae 7 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1928).
- Iordanes, *De origine Actibusque Getarum* = Iordanes, *De Origine Actibusque Getarum*, ed. Francesco Giunta and Antonino Grillone, Fonti per La Storia d'Italia 117 (Roma: Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, 1991).
- Isidore of Seville, *Concilium Toletanum XI* = Isidore of Seville, 'Concilium Toletanum XI', in *Sancti Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Opera Omnia 8*, ed. Faustino Arevalo, PL 84 (Paris, 1850), 451–68.
- Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarvm* = Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarvm Sive Originvm Libri XX*, ed. Wallace Martin Lindsay, 1–2 (Oxford: OUP, 1911).
- Isidore of Seville, *Historia Gothorum* = Isidore of Seville, 'Historia Gothorum, Vandalorum et Sueborum Ad A. DCXXIV', in *Chronica Minora Saec. IV. V. VI. VII. (II)*, ed. Theodor Mommsen, MGH AA 11 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1894), 241–303.

- Jackson, ed., *Ordines coronationis* = Richard A. Jackson, ed., *Ordines Coronationis Franciae: Texts and Ordines for the Coronation of Frankish and French Kings and Queens in the Middle Ages*, 1-2 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995).
- Jakob Vogel, *Vngrische Schlacht* = András F. Balogh and Orsolya Lénárt, eds., *Ungarnbilder im 17. Jahrhundert: Studien und Editionen der Texte: Jakob Vogel: 'Vngrische Schlacht' (1626), Kapitel aus Martin Zeillers 'Neue Beschreibung des Königreichs Ungarn' (1664), Salomon Schweiggers 'Gezweyte neue nutzliche und anmuthige Reiß-Beschreibung' (1664) und aus Eberhard Werner Happsels 'Thesaurus Exoticorum' (1688)* (Budapest: ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, 2013).
- Jerome, *Commentariorum in Jeremiam Prophetam* = Jerome, 'Commentariorum in Jeremiam Prophetam', PL 24 (Paris, 1865), 679–900.
- Jerome, *Translatio Chronicorum* = Jerome, 'Translatio Chronicorum Eusebii Pamphili', in *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Opera Omnia*, PL 27 (Paris, 1866), 9–508.
- John of Worcester, *Florentii Wigorniensis* = John of Worcester, *Florentii Wigorniensis monachi Chronicon ex Chronicis*, ed. Benjamin Thorpe, 1 (London, 1848).
- Julian of Toledo, *Historia Wambae* = Julian of Toledo, 'Historia Wambae Regis', in *Passiones Vitaeque Sanctorum Aevi Merovingici (III)*, ed. Wilhelm Levison, MGH SRM 5 (Hannover – Leipzig: Hahn, 1910), 486–535.
- Julian of Toledo, *The story of Wamba* = Julian of Toledo, *The Story of Wamba: Julian of Toledo's Historia Wambae Regis*, trans. Joaquín Martínez Pizarro (Washington: CUAP, 2005).
- Kronika Węgierskopolska* = Stanisław Pilat, ed., 'Kronika Węgierskopolska', in *MPH*, by August Bielowski, 1 (Lwów, 1864), 495–515.
- Krug von Nidda, *Heinrich* = Friedrich Albert Franz Krug von Nidda, *Heinrich der Finkler: Oder, die Ungarn-Schlacht: Historisches Drama in Vier Akten* (Leipzig: Dyck, 1818).
- Le Chevalier as deus espees* = Paul Vincent Rockwell, ed., *Le Chevalier as Deus Espees*, French Arthurian Romance 3 (Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 2006).
- Legenda Christiani* = Jaroslav Ludvíkovský, *Legenda Christiani. Vita et Passio Sancti Wenceslai et Sancte Ludmille Ave Eius* (Praha: Vyšehrad, 1978).
- Legenda S. Ladislai regis* = Emma Bartoniek, ed., 'Legenda Sancti Ladislai Regis', in *SRH*, 2 (Budapestinum: Academia Litterarum Hungarica, 1938), 515–27.
- Legenda Sancti Stephani regis ab Hartvico* = Emma Bartoniek, ed., 'Legenda Sancti Stephani Regis Ab Hartvico Episcopo Conscripta', in *SRH*, 2 (Budapestinum: Academia Litterarum Hungarica, 1938), 401–40.
- Leo Grammaticus, *Chronographia* = Leo Grammaticus, 'Chronographia', in *Leo Grammaticus. Eustachius*, ed. Immanuel Bekker, CSB 31 (Bonn: ED. Weber, 1842), 3–331.
- Leo of Vercelli, *Versus de Gregorio* = Leo of Vercelli, 'Versus De Gregorio et Ottone Augusto', in *die Ottonenzeit*, ed. Karl Strecker and Norbert Fickermann, MGH Poetae 5 (Leipzig: Hiersemann, 1937), 477–80.
- Leo of Vercelli, *Versus de Ottone* = Leo of Vercelli, 'Versus de Ottone et Heinrich', in *die Ottonenzeit*, ed. Karl Strecker and Norbert Fickermann, MGH Poetae 5 (Leipzig: Hiersemann, 1937), 480–83.
- Les Annales de Flodoard* = Flodoard of Reims, *Les Annales de Flodoard*, ed. Philippe Lauer, Collection de Textes Pour Servir À L'étude et À l'enseignement de l'histoire (Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1905).
- Li chevaliers as deus espees* = Wendelin Foerster, ed., *Li Chevaliers as Deus Espees. Altfranzösischer Abenteuerroman* (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1877).
- Liudprand, *Liudprand* = Liudprand, *Liudprand de Crémone: oeuvres*, trans. François Bougard, Sources d'histoire médiévale 41 (Paris: CNRS, 2015).
- Liudprand of Cremona, 'Legatio Luitprandi' = Liudprand of Cremona, 'Legatio Luitprandi Cremonensis Episcopi Ad Nicephorum Phocam Imper.', in *Chronicon Victoris Episcopi Tynnvnensis: Chronicon Joannis Biclarensis Episcopi Gerundensis*, ed. Henricus Canisius (Ingolstadii, 1600), 71–125.

- Liudprand of Cremona, *The Complete* = Liudprand of Cremona, *The Complete Works of Liudprand of Cremona*, trans. Paolo Squatriti (Washington: CUAP, 2007).
- Liudprand von Cremona, *Die Werke* = Liudprand von Cremona, *Die Werke Liudprands von Cremona*, ed. Joseph Becker, MGH SRG 41 (Hannover-Leipzig: Hahn, 1915).
- Liudprandus Cremonensis, *Opera Omnia* = Liudprandus Cremonensis, *Opera Omnia*, ed. Paolo Chiesa, CCCM 156 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998).
- Liutprando de Cremona, *La Antapódosis* = Liutprando de Cremona, *La Antapódosis o retribución de Liutprando de Cremona*, ed. Pablo A. Cavallero et al. (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2007).
- Liutprando, *Antapodosis* = Liutprando, *Antapodosis*, trans. Paolo Chiesa, *Scrittori greci e latini* (Milano: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla/Mondadori, 2015).
- Mainzer Ordo = Percy Ernst Schramm, ed., 'Mainzer Ordo – Ordo Qualiter Rex Ordinari Debet', in *Kaiser, Könige und Päpste. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*, by Percy Ernst Schramm, 3 (Vom 10. bis zum 13. Jahrhundert) (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1969), 92–103.
- Malory, *Le Morte* = sir Thomas Malory, *Le Morte Darthur*, ed. William Caxton and Heinrich Oskar Sommer (London: David Nutt, 1889).
- Meginhardus, *Annalium Fuldensium* = Meginhardus, 'Annalium Fuldensium Pars Tertia (Mogontiacensis)', in *Annales Fuldenses Sive Annales Regni Francorum Orientalis*, ed. Friedrich Kurze, MGH SRG 7 (Hannover: Hahn, 1891), 62–107.
- Migne, ed., 'Benedictio Crucis' = Jacques Paul Migne, ed., 'Benedictio Crucis', in *Appendix Ad Saeculum X Complectens Auctores Incerti Anni et Opera Adespotika*, PL 138 (Paris, 1853).
- Monsabert, *Chartes et documents* = Pierre de Monsabert, *Chartes et Documents Pour Servir À l'histoire de l'abbaye de Charroux*, Archives Historiques Du Poitou 39 (Poitiers: Société française d'imprimerie et de librairie, 1910).
- Nithardi *Historiarum libri IIII* = Nithard, *Nithardi Historiarum Libri IIII*, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz, MGH SRG 44 (Hannover: Hahn, 1907).
- Notkerus Balbulus, *Gesta Karoli* = Notkerus Balbulus, *Gesta Karoli Magni Imperatoris*, ed. Hans F. Haefele, MGH SRG-NS 12 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1959).
- Odilo of Cluny, *Epitaphium Adelheidae* = Odilo of Cluny, 'Epitaphium Adelheidae Imperatricis', in *Annales, Chronica et Historiae Aevi Carolini et Saxonici*, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz, MGH Scriptores 4 (Hannover: Hahn, 1841), 637–45.
- Ordericus Vitalis, *The ecclesiastical history* = Ordericus Vitalis, *The ecclesiastical history of Orderic Vitalis*, trans. Marjorie Chibnall, 1–6, OMT (Oxford: Clarendon Press; OUP, 1969–1980).
- Origenes, *Homiliae in Exodum* = Origenes, 'Homiliae in Exodum', in *Opera Omnia*, 2, Patrologiae Graecae 12 (Paris, 1862), 297–396.
- Otonis episcopi Frisingensis *Chronica* = Otto of Freising, *Otonis Episcopi Frisingensis Chronica Sive Historia de Duabus Civitatibus*, ed. Adolfus Hofmeister, MGH SRG 45 (Hannover – Leipzig: Hahn, 1912).
- Paul the Deacon, *Historia gentis Langobardorum* = Paul the Deacon, 'Historia Gentis Langobardorum', in *Scriptores Rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum Saec. VI–IX*, ed. Ludwig Bethmann and Georg Waitz, MGH SRL 1 (Hannover: Hahn, 1878), 12–197.
- Peter, ed., *Pismo Święte* = Michał Peter, ed., *Pismo Święte Starego i Nowego Testamentu w przekładzie z języków oryginalnych, ze wstępami i komentarzami*, 2 (Poznań: Księgarnia św Wojciecha, 1984).
- Procopius of Caesarea, *The Persian War* = Procopius of Caesarea, 'The Persian War', in *Procopius I*, trans. H. B. Dewing, LCL 48 (London: Heinemann, 1914), 1–557.
- Ratherius Veronensis, *Praeloquiorum libri VI* = Ratherius Veronensis, 'Praeloquiorum Libri VI', in *Praeloquiorum Libri VI; Phrenesis; Dialogus Confessionalis; Exhortatio et Preces*, ed. Peter L. D. Reid, CCCM 46A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1984), 1–196.

- Rauschen, die *Legende Karls* = Gerhard Rauschen, ed., die *Legende Karls des Großen im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert. Mit Einem Anhang Über Urkunden Karls des Großen und Friedrichs I. für Aachen von Hugo Loersch*, Publikationen der Gesellschaft für Rheinische Geschichtskunde 7 (Leipzig: Duncker&Humblot, 1890).
- Regino of Prüm = Regino of Prüm, *Reginonis Abbatis Prumiensis Chronicon Cum Continuatione Treverensi*, ed. Frederick Kurze, MGH SRG 50 (Hannover: Hahn, 1890).
- Regino of Prüm and Adalbert of Magdeburg, *History and politics* = Regino of Prüm and Adalbert of Magdeburg, *History and Politics in Late Carolingian and Ottonian Europe: The Chronicle of Regino of Prüm and Adalbert of Magdeburg*, trans. Simon MacLean (Manchester: MUP, 2009).
- Richer, *Historiae* = Richer, *Historiae*, ed. Hartmut Hoffmann, MGH Scriptores 38 (Hannover: Hahn, 2000).
- Rufinus Aquileiensis, *Historiae Ecclesiasticae* = Rufinus Aquileiensis, 'Historiae Ecclesiasticae Libri Duo', in *Tyrannii Rufini Opera Omnia I*, ed. Dominicus Vallarsius and Jacques Paul Migne, PL 21 (Paris, 1849), 463–624.
- Rufinus of Aquileia, *The Church History* = Rufinus of Aquileia, *The Church History of Rufinus of Aquileia Books 10 and 11*, trans. Philip R. Amidon (New York: OUP, 1997).
- S. *Otonis Episcopi Babenbergensis Vita Prieflingensis* = Jan Wikarjak and Kazimierz Liman, eds., *S. Otonis Episcopi Babenbergensis Vita Prieflingensis*, 1, MPH SN 7 (Warszawa: PWN, 1966).
- Sachsenspiegel* = Eike von Repgow, *Sachsenspiegel. Teil 1: Landrecht*, ed. Karl August Eckhardt, 1, MGH Fontes Iuris GA, Nova Series 1 (Göttingen: Musterschmidt, 1955).
- Saga Sverris konungs* = Carl Christian Rafn and Finnur Magnusson, eds., *Saga Sverris Konungs* (Kaupmannahöfn: Í Poppsku prentsmiðju, 1834).
- Samsonus Abbas, *Opus de miraculis sancti Ædmundi* = Samsonus Abbas, 'Opus de Miraculis Sancti Ædmundi', in *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. Thomas Arnold, RBMAS 1 (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1890), 107–208.
- Saxo Grammaticus = Saxo Grammaticus, *Saxonis Gesta Danorum*, ed. C. Knabe et al., 1 (Copenhagen: Levin&Munksgaard, 1931).
- Saxo Grammaticus, *Gesta Danorum: Mythen und Legenden* = Saxo Grammaticus, *Gesta Danorum: Mythen und Legenden des berühmten mittelalterlichen Geschichtsschreibers Saxo Grammaticus*, trans. Hans-Jürgen Hube (Wiesbaden: Marixverl., 2004).
- Sedulius Scottus, *Liber de rectoribus Christianis* = Sedulius, Scotus, 'Liber de Rectoribus Christianis', in *Sedulius Scottus*, ed. Siegmund Hellman, 1, Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters 1 (München: Minerva G.M.B.H., 1906), 1–91.
- Siegebert of Gembloux, *Vita Deoderici* = Siegebert of Gembloux, 'Vita Deoderici Episcopi Mettensis', in *Annales, Chronica et Historiae Aevi Carolini et Saxonici*, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz, MGH Scriptores 4 (Hannover: Hahn, 1841), 461–83.
- Smyser, ed., *The Pseudo-Turpin* = H. M. Smyser, ed., *The Pseudo-Turpin, Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds Latin, MS. 17656*, Medieval Academy Books 30 (Cambridge, MA, 1937).
- Snorri Sturluson, *Haraldz saga harðráða* = Snorri Sturluson, 'Haraldz Saga Harðráða', in *Heimskringla, Noregs Konunga Sögur*, by Snorri Sturluson, ed. Finnur Jónsson, 3 (København: S. L. Møllers Bogtrykkeri, 1893), 74–224.
- Staročeská kronika tak řečeného Dalimila* = Jiří Daňhelka et al., eds., *Staročeská Kronika Tak Řečeného Dalimila* (Praha, 1988).
- Tacitus, *Germania* = Tacitus, 'Germania', in *Tacitus I*, by Tacitus, trans. M. Hutton, LCL 35 (London: HUP, 1996), 119–215.
- Tempore illo* = M. Perlbach, ed., 'Tempore Illo (De Sancto Adalberto Episcopo)', in *Supplementa Tomorum I-XII, Pars III. Supplementum Tomi XIII*, 2, MGH Scriptores 15 (Hannover: Hahn, 1888), 1177–84.

- Terentius, *The Eunuch* = Terentius, 'The Eunuch', in *Terence I*, by Terence, trans. Hohn Sargeaunt, LCL 22 (London: HUP, 1994), 231–351.
- Terentius, *The Lady from Andros* = Terentius, 'The Lady from Andros', in *Terence I*, by Terence, trans. Hohn Sargeaunt, LCL 22 (London: HUP, 1994), 1–111.
- The Ancient Irish Epic Tale Táin Bó Cúailnge* = Joseph Dunn, trans., *The Ancient Irish Epic Tale Táin Bó Cúailnge* (London, 1914).
- Theganus, *Gesta Hludowici Imperatoris* = Theganus, 'Gesta Hludowici Imperatoris', in *Thegan, die Taten Kaiser Ludwigs. Astronomus, das Leben Kaiser Ludwigs*, ed. Ernst Tremp, MGH SRG 64 (Hannover: Hahn, 1995), 167–277.
- Theodorus Monachus, *Annales Palidenses* = Theodorus Manhus, 'Annales Palidenses', in *Annales Aevi Suevici*, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz, MGH Scriptores 16 (Hannover: Hahn, 1859), 48–98.
- Theophanes Continuatus, *Constantini Imperium* = Theophanes Continuatus, 'Chronographia', in *Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus*, ed. Immanuel Bekker, CSB 45 (Bonn: ED. Weber, 1838), 436–69.
- Thietmar, *Chronik* = Thietmar of Merseburg, die *Chronik des Bischofs Thietmar von Merseburg und Ihre Korveier Überarbeitung*, ed. Robert Holtzmann, MGH SRG-NS 9 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1935).
- Thietmar, *Ottonian Germany* = Thietmar, *Ottonian Germany: The Chronicon of Thietmar of Merseburg*, trans. David Warner, Manchester Medieval Sources Series (Manchester: MUP, 2001).
- Thomas Ebendorfer, *Chronica regum Romanorum* = Thomas Ebendorfer, *Chronica regum Romanorum* 1. 1., ed. Harald Zimmermann, MGH SRG-NS 18 (Hannover: Hahn, 2003).
- Ughelli, ed., 'Translatio S. Hymerii Episcopi' = Ferdinand Ughelli, ed., 'Translatio S. Hymerii Episcopi Amerini in Cremonensi Ecclesia', in *Italia Sacra Sive de Episcopis Italiae*, 4 (Venetiis, 1719), 589–91.
- Unterkircher, ed., *Das Kollektar-Pontifikale* = Franz Unterkircher, ed., *das Kollektar-Pontifikale des Bischofs Baturich von Regensburg (817-848)*. (*Cod. Vindob. Ser N. 2762*), Spicilegium Friburgense: Textes Pour Servir À L'histoire de La Vie Chrétienne (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1962).
- Venantius Fortunatus, *Liber de virtutibus sancti Hilarii* = Venantius Fortunatus, 'Liber de Virtutibus Sancti Hilarii', in *Venanti Honori Clementiani Fortunati Presbyteri Italici Opera Pedestria*, ed. Bruno Krusch, 2, MGH AA 4 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1885), 7–11.
- Vergilius, *Aeneid* = Vergilius, 'Aeneidos', in *Opera*, by P. Vergili Maronis, ed. R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford: OUP, 1972), 103–422.
- Vergilius, *Georgicon* = Vergilius, 'Georgicon', in *Opera*, by P. Vergili Maronis, ed. R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford: OUP, 1972), 29–101.
- Vita Gerardi abbatis Broniensis* = Lothar von Heinemann, ed., 'Vita Gerardi Abbatis Broniensis', in *Supplementa Tomorum I-XII, Pars III. Supplementum Tomi XIII*, 2, MGH Scriptores 15 (Hannover: Hahn, 1888), 654–73.
- Vita Gregorii II* = Louis Duchesne, ed., 'Vita Gregorii II', in *Le Liber Pontificalis. Texte, Introduction et Commentaire*, 1 (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1955), 396–414.
- Vita S. Wiboradae* = Hartmann, 'Vita S. Wiboradae', in *Annales, Chronica et Historiae Aevi Carolini et Saxonici*, ed. Georg Waitz, MGH Scriptores 4 (Hannover: Hahn, 1841), 452–57.
- Vita Sergii II* = Louis Duchesne, ed., 'Vita Sergii II', in *Le Liber Pontificalis. Texte, Introduction et Commentaire*, 2 (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1955), 86–105.
- VMra* = Bernd Schütte, ed., 'Vita Mathildis Reginae Antiquior', in *Die Lebensbeschreibungen der Königin Mathilde*, MGH SRG 66 (Hannover: Hahn, 1994), 109–42.
- VMrp* = Bernd Schütte, ed., 'Vita Mathildis Reginae Posterior', in *Die Lebensbeschreibungen der Königin Mathilde*, MGH SRG 66 (Hannover: Hahn, 1994), 145–202.
- Vogl, 'Heinrich der Vogler' = Johann Nepomuk Vogl, 'Heinrich der Vogler', in *Balladen, Romanzen, Sagen und Legenden* (Wien: F.B Wallishausser, 1846), 52–53.

- Walafrid Strabo, *Libellus de exordiis* = Walafrid Strabo, 'Libellus de Exordiis et Incrementis Quarundam in Observationibus Ecclesiasticis Rerum', in *Capitularia Regum Francorum*, ed. Alfred Boretius and Victor Krause, MGH Leges 2 (Hannover: Hahn, 1897), 473–516.
- Walafrid Strabo, *Vita s. Galli confessoris* = Walafrid Strabo, 'Vita S. Galli Confessoris', in *Passiones Vitaeque Sanctorum Aevi Merovingici (II)*, ed. Bruno Krusch, MGH SRM 4, (Hannover – Leipzig: Hahn, 1902), 280–337.
- Widukind of Corvey, *Die Sachsengeschichte* = Widukind of Corvey, *die Sachsengeschichte des Widukind von Korvei*, ed. Hans-Eberhard Lohmann and Paul Hirsch, MGH SRG 60 (Hannover: Hahn, 1935).
- William of Malmesbury, *De gestis regum* = William of Malmesbury, *De Gestis Regum Anglorum*, ed. William Stubbs (London, 1964).
- William of Poitiers, *Gesta Guillelmi* = William of Poitiers, *Gesta Guillelmi*, ed. R. H. C. Davis and Marjorie Chibnall, OMT (Oxford: Clarendon Press; OUP, 1998).
- Wincent of Kielcza, *Vita Sancti Stanislai Cracoviensis Episcopi (Vita Maior)* = Wincent of Kielcza, 'Vita Sancti Stanislai Cracoviensis Episcopi (Vita Maior)', in *MPH*, by August Bielowski, ed. Wojciech Kętrzyński, 4 (Lwów, 1864), 319–438.
- Wipo, *Gesta Chuonradi* = Wipo, 'Gesta Chuonradi Imperatoris', in *die Werke Wipos*, by Wipo, ed. Harry Bresslau, MGH SRG 61 (Hannover – Leipzig: Hahn, 1915).

Translations

- Bachrach = Widukind, *Deeds of the Saxons*, trans. Bernard S. Bachrach and David Stewart Bachrach, Medieval Texts in Translation (Washington, D.C.: CUAP, 2014).
- Bergman = Hrotsvit, 'Gesta Ottonis', in *Hrosvithae Liber Tertius. A Text with Translation, Introduction and Commentary*, trans. Mary Bernardine Bergman (unpublished Ph.D., Saint Louis University, 1942), 38–85.
- Chibnall = Ordericus Vitalis, *The ecclesiastical history of Orderic Vitalis*, trans. Marjorie Chibnall, 1–6 (Oxford: Clarendon Press; OUP, 2002).
- Davis 1995 = Raymond Davis, trans., *The Lives of the Ninth-Century Popes (Liber Pontificalis): The Ancient Biographies of Ten Popes from A.D. 817–891*, Translated Texts for Historians 20 (Liverpool: LUP, 1995).
- Davis 2007 = Raymond Davis, trans., *The Lives of the Eighth-Century Popes (Liber Pontificalis): The Ancient Biographies of Nine Popes from AD 715 to AD 817*, Rev. ed, Translated Texts for Historians 13 (Liverpool: LUP, 2007).
- Day Lewis = Vergilius, 'The Aeneid', in *The Eclogues, The Georgics, The Aeneid*, trans. C. Day Lewis, Great Books of the Western World 12 (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1990), 81–321.
- Dobozy = Eike von Repgow, *The Saxon Mirror: A Sachsenspiegel of the Fourteenth Century*, trans. Maria Dobozy, The Middle Ages Series (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999).
- Gilsdorf = Sean Gilsdorf, trans., *Queenship and Sanctity: the lives of Mathilda and the epitaph of Adelheid* (Washington-London: CUAP; Eurospan, 2004).
- Hollander = Snorri Sturluson, *Heimskringla; History of the Kings of Norway*, trans. Lee M. Hollander (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1964).
- Knoll and Schaer = Gallus, *Gesta Principum Polonorum = The Deeds of the Princes of the Poles*, trans. Paul W. Knoll and Frank Schaer, Central European Medieval Texts 3 (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2007).
- Macdonald = Cicero, 'In Catilinam', in *Cicero X*, by Cicero, trans. C. Macdonald, LCL 324 (London, 1996), 2–165.

- MacLean = Regino of Prüm and Adalbert of Magdeburg, *History and Politics in Late Carolingian and Ottonian Europe: The Chronicle of Regino of Prüm and Adalbert of Magdeburg*, trans. Simon MacLean (Manchester: MUP, 2009).
- Martínez Pizarro = Julian of Toledo, *The Story of Wamba: Julian of Toledo's Historia Wambae Regis*, trans. Joaquín Martínez Pizarro (Washington: CUAP, 2005).
- McCarthy = Frutolf and Eccardus, *Chronicles of the Investiture Contest: Frutolf of Michelsberg and His Continuator*, trans. Thomas John Henry McCarthy (Manchester: MUP, 2014).
- Muir and Turner = Eadmer of Canterbury, 'Vita Dunstani', in *Eadmer of Canterbury: Lives and Miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan, and Oswald*, by Eadmer of Canterbury, trans. Bernard J. Muir and Andrew J. Turner, OMT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006), 44–158.
- Noble = Thomas F.X. Noble, trans., *Charlemagne and Louis the Pious: the lives by Einhard, Notker, Ermoldus, Thegan, and the Astronomer* (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009).
- Reid = Ratherius, *The Complete Works of Rather of Verona*, trans. Peter L. D. Reid, Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies 76 (Binghamton, N.Y.: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1991).
- Scholz and Rogers = Nithard, *Carolingian Chronicles: Royal Frankish Annals and Nithard's Histories*, trans. Bernhard Walter Scholz and Barbara Rogers (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1972).
- Scott and Swinton Bland = Caesarius of Heisterbach, *The Dialogue on Miracles*, trans. Henry von Essen Scott and Charles Cooke Swinton Bland, 1-2, Broadway Medieval Library 1 (London: George Routledge & Sons, 1929).
- Squatriti = Liudprand of Cremona, *The Complete Works of Liudprand of Cremona*, trans. Paolo Squatriti (Washington: CUAP, 2007).
- Wallace-Hadrill = Fredegar, *The Fourth book of the Chronicle of Fredegar with its continuations*, trans. John Michael Wallace-Hadrill (Edinburgh, 1960).
- Warner = Thietmar, *Ottonian Germany: The Chronicon of Thietmar of Merseburg*, trans. David Warner, Manchester Medieval Sources Series (Manchester: MUP, 2001).
- Watson = John Selby Watson, trans., *Justin, Cornelius Nepos, and Eutropius: Literally Translated with Notes and an Index*, Bohn's Classical Library (London: G. Bell, 1853).

Films

- Ewiger Wald* = Hanns Springer and von Sonjevski-Jamrowski Rolf, *Ewiger Wald*, (1936).
- Otto und das Reich* = Christian Twente, Stephen Koester, and Robert Wiezorek, *Otto und das Reich*, (2008).

Secondary Sources

- Howard L. Adelson, 'The Holy Lance and the Hereditary German Monarchy', *The Art Bulletin* 48, no. 2 (1 June 1966): 177–92.
- Stuart Airlie, 'The Nearly Men: Boso of Vienne and Arnulf of Bavaria', in *Nobles and Nobility in Medieval Europe: Concepts, Origins, Transformations*, ed. Anne Duggan (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2000), 25–41.
- Nicholas Boyter Aitchison, 'Regicide in Early Medieval Ireland', in *Violence and Society in the Early Medieval West*, ed. Guy Halsall (Rochester: Boydell Press, 1998), 108–25.

- Michael von Albrecht, *A History of Roman Literature: From Livius Andronicus to Boethius: With Special Regard to Its Influence on World Literature*, 1, Mnemosyne, Bibliotheca Classica Batava 165 (Leiden-New York: Brill, 1997).
- Paul J. Alexander, 'The Strength of Empire and Capital as Seen through Byzantine Eyes', *Speculum* 37, no. 3 (1 July 1962): 339–57.
- Dwight D. Allman, 'Sin and the Construction of Carolingian Kingship', in *The Seven Deadly Sins: From Communities to Individuals*, ed. Richard Newhauser, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions 123 (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2007), 21–40.
- Gerd Althoff, *Adels- und Königsfamilien im Spiegel ihrer Memorialüberlieferung: Studien zum Totengedenken der Billunger und Ottonen: Bestandteil des Quellenwerkes, Societas et fraternitas*, Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften 47 (München: W. Fink, 1984).
- Gerd Althoff, *Amicitia und pacta: Bündnis, Einung, Politik und Gebetsgedenken im beginnenden 10. Jahrhundert*, MGH Schriften 37 (Hannover: Hahn, 1992).
- Gerd Althoff, 'Causa scribendi und Darstellungsabsicht: Die Lebensbeschreibungen der Königin Mathilde und andere Beispiele', in *Litterae medii aevi: Festschrift für Johanne Autenrieth zu ihrem 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Michael Borgolte and Herrad Spilling (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1988), 117–33.
- Gerd Althoff, 'Das Privileg der *deditio*. Formen gütlicher Konfliktbeendigung in der mittelalterlichen Adelsgesellschaft', in *Spielregeln der Politik im Mittelalter: Kommunikation in Frieden und Fehde*, by Gerd Althoff (Darmstadt: Primus, 1997), 99–125.
- Gerd Althoff, 'Der friedens-, bündnis- und gemeinschaftstiftende Charakter des Mahles im früheren Mittelalter', in *Essen und Trinken in Mittelalter und Neuzeit*, ed. Irmgard Bitsch, Trude Ehlert, and Xenja von Ertzdorff (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1990), 13–26.
- Gerd Althoff, 'Der König als Konfliktpartei. Möglichkeiten und Grenzen von Vermittlung im Hochmittelalter', in *Frieden Stiften: Vermittlung und Konfliktlösung vom Mittelalter bis Heute*, ed. Gerd Althoff, (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2010), 81–97.
- Gerd Althoff, ed., *Die Deutschen und ihr Mittelalter: Themen und Funktionen moderner Geschichtsbilder vom Mittelalter*, Ausblicke (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1992).
- Gerd Althoff, *Die Macht der Rituale: Symbolik und Herrschaft im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt: Primus, 2003).
- Gerd Althoff, *Die Ottonen: Königsherrschaft ohne Staat* (Stuttgart-Berlin-Köln: Kohlhammer, 2005).
- Gerd Althoff, *Family, friends and followers: political and social bonds in medieval Europe*, trans. Christopher Carroll (Cambridge-New York: CUP, 2004).
- Gerd Althoff, 'Formen und Funktionen von Mythen im Mittelalter', in *Mythos und Nation*, ed. Helmut Berding (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1996), 11–33.
- Gerd Althoff, 'Geschichtsschreibung in einer oralen Gesellschaft. das Beispiel des 10. Jahrhunderts', in *Ottotonische Neuanfänge. Symposion zur Ausstellung 'Otto der Große, Magdeburg und Europa'*, ed. Bernd Schneidmüller and Stefan Weinfurter (Mainz: von Zabern, 2001), 151–69.
- Gerd Althoff, '"Gloria et nomen perpetuum". Wodurch wurde man im Mittelalter berühmt?', in *Person und Gemeinschaft im Mittelalter: Karl Schmid zum fünfundsechzigsten Geburtstag*, ed. Gerd Althoff (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1988), 297–314.
- Gerd Althoff, 'Staatsdiener Oder Häupter des Staates. Fürstenverantwortung. Zwischen Reichsinteresse und Eigennutz', in *Spielregeln der Politik im Mittelalter: Kommunikation in Frieden und Fehde*, by Gerd Althoff (Darmstadt: Primus, 1997), 126–53.
- Gerd Althoff, 'The Variability of Rituals in the Middle Ages', in *Medieval Concepts of the Past: Ritual, Memory, Historiography*, ed. Gerd Althoff, Johannes Fried, and Patrick J. Geary (Washington-Cambridge: German Historical Institute; CUP, 2002), 71–87.
- Gerd Althoff, 'Widukind von Corvey. Kronzeuge und Herausforderung', *FMSt* 27 (1993): 253–72.
- Gerd Althoff, 'Zur Frage Nach der Organisation Sächsischer Coniurationes in der Ottonenzeit', *FMSt* 16 (1982): 129–42.

- Gerd Althoff and Hagen Keller, *Die Zeit des späten Karolinger und der Ottonen: Krisen und Konsolidierungen, 888-1024*, Gebhardt. Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte. Zehnte, völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage 3 (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 2008).
- Gerd Althoff and Christel Meier, *Ironie im Mittelalter: Hermeneutik-Dichtung-Politik* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2011).
- Gerd Althoff and Christiane Witthöft, 'Les services symboliques entre dignité et contrainte', *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 58, no. 6 (2003): 1293–1318.
- Arnold Angenendt, *Geschichte der Religiosität im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt: Primus, 1997).
- Arnold Angenendt, 'Rex et sacerdos: Zur Genese der Königssalbung', in *Tradition als historische Kraft: interdisziplinäre Forschungen zur Geschichte des früheren Mittelalters*, ed. Norbert Kamp and Joachim Wollasch (Berlin-New York: de Gruyter, 1982), 100–118.
- Haki Antonsson, *St. Magnús of Orkney: A Scandinavian Martyr-Cult in Context*, Northern World 29 (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2007).
- Anastasia Anufrieva, 'Молитва Перед Священным Копьем: Описание Битвы При Биртене в "Антаподосисе" Лиутпранда Кремонского', in Подсекция 'История Средних Веков – Западная Европа И Византия' (Международная научная конференция студентов, аспирантов и молодых ученых 'Ломоносов-2013', Москва, 2013).
- Leopold Auer, 'Der Kriegsdienst des Klerus unter den Sächsischen Kaisern', *MIÖG* 79, no. 3–4 (1971): 316–407.
- Leopold Auer, 'Der Kriegsdienst des Klerus unter den Sächsischen Kaisern. 2. Verfassungsgeschichtliche Probleme', *MIÖG* 80 (1972): 48–70.
- Greta Austin, *Shaping Church Law around the Year 1000: The Decretum of Burchard of Worms, Church, Faith, and Culture in the Medieval West* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).
- Raphaela Averkorn, 'The Process of Nationbuilding in Medieval Germany. A Brief Overview', in *Nations and Nationalities in Historical Perspective*, ed. Gudmundur Hálfðanarson and Ann Katherine Isaacs, Clíoh's Workshop 3 (Pisa: PLUS, 2001), 177–98.
- Bernard S. Bachrach, "'Caballus et Caballarius" in Medieval Warfare', in *Warfare and Military Organization in Pre-Crusade Europe*, ed. Bernard S. Bachrach (Aldershot: Ashgate/Variorum, 2002), 173–211.
- Bernard S. Bachrach, *Early Carolingian Warfare: Prelude to Empire*, The Middle Ages Series (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001).
- Bernard S. Bachrach and David Stewart Bachrach, 'Early Saxon Frontier Warfare: Henry I, Otto I, and Carolingian Military Institutions', *The Journal of Medieval Military History* 76 (2012): 17–60.
- Bernard S. Bachrach and David Stewart Bachrach, 'Saxon Military Revolution, 912–973?: Myth and Reality', *EME* 15, no. 2 (2007): 186–222.
- David Stewart Bachrach, 'Conforming with the Rhetorical Tradition of Plausibility: Clerical Representation of Battlefield Orations against Muslims, 1080-1170', *The International History Review* 26, no. 1 (2004): 1–19.
- David Stewart Bachrach, 'Memory, Epistemology, and the Writing of Early Medieval Military History: The Example of Bishop Thietmar of Merseburg (1009-1018)', *Viator* 38 (2007): 63–90.
- David Stewart Bachrach, *Religion and the Conduct of War, C. 300-1215*, Warfare in History (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003).
- David Stewart Bachrach, *Warfare in Tenth-Century Germany*, Warfare in History (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2012).
- Barbara Baert, *A Heritage of Holy Wood: The Legend of the True Cross in Text and Image*, trans. Lee Preedy, Cultures, Beliefs, and Traditions 22 (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2004).

- Sverre H. Bagge, *Kings, Politics, and the Right Order of the World in German Historiography C. 950-1150* (Leiden: Brill, 2002).
- Sverre H. Bagge, 'The Model Emperor: Einhard's Charlemagne in Widukind and Rahewin', *Viator* 43, no. 49-78 (2012).
- János M. Bak, 'Medieval Symbolology of the State: Percy E. Schramm's Contribution', *Viator* 4 (1973): 33-63.
- Ross Balzaretti, 'Liutprand of Cremona's Sense of Humour', in *Humour, History and Politics in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Guy Halsall (Cambridge-New York: CUP, 2002), 114-28.
- Jacek Banaszkiewicz, 'Bischof Alberich von Marsica und Seine Reliquiengeschenke für Dietrich von Metz und Otto I. "Translatio S. Alexandri" und "Inventio Sanctorum"', *FMSt* 46 (2012): 99-156.
- Jacek Banaszkiewicz, 'Conrad II's Theatrum Rituale: Wipo on the Earliest Deeds of the Salian Ruler (Gesta Chuonradi Imperatoris Cap. 5)', in *Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages: A Cultural History*, ed. Piotr Górecki and Nancy Van Deusen, International Library of Historical Studies 51 (London-New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2009), 50-63.
- Jacek Banaszkiewicz, 'Czym była i jak została zniszczona chorągiew Świętowita? (Saxo Grammaticus, Gesta Danorum, XIV, 39, 14-28)', in *Heraldikai Okolice*, ed. Andrzej Rachuba, Sławomir Górzyński, and Halina Manikowska (Warszawa: 'DiG', 2002), 57-70.
- Jacek Banaszkiewicz, 'Die Mäuserthumsage – the Symbolism of Annihilation of an Evil Ruler', *APH* 51 (1985): 5-32.
- Jacek Banaszkiewicz, 'Jak Erenfried Ezzo wygrał od Ottona III jego siostrę Matyldę', in *Aetas media, aetas moderna: studia ofiarowane profesorowi Henrykowi Samsonowiczowi w siedemdziesiąt rocznice urodzin*, ed. Halina Manikowska, Agnieszka Bartoszewicz, and Wojciech Falkowski (Warszawa: Instytut Historyczny Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 2000), 375-86.
- Jacek Banaszkiewicz, *Podanie o Piaście i Popielu: studium porównawcze nad wczesnośredniowiecznymi tradycjami dynastycznymi* (Warszawa: PWN, 2010).
- Jacek Banaszkiewicz, *Polskie dzieje bajeczne Mistrza Wincentego Kadłubka*, Monografie Fundacji Na Rzecz Nauki Polskiej (Wrocław: Leopoldinum, 1998).
- Jacek Banaszkiewicz, 'Rudolf, Król Herulów, który grał (Paweł Diakon, Hist. Long., I,20)', in *E scientia et amicitia: studia poświęcone profesorowi Edwardowi Potkowskiemu w sześćdziesięciolecie urodzin i czterdziestolecie pracy naukowej*, ed. Marcin Drzewiecki et al. (Warszawa-Pułtusk: Wyższa Szkoła Humanistyczna, 1999), 23-31.
- Jacek Banaszkiewicz, 'Włócznia i chorągiew: O rycie otwierania bitwy w związku z cudem kampanii nakielskiej Bolesława Krzywoustego (Kadłubek, III,14)', *KH* 94, no. 4 (1987): 3-24.
- Jacek Banaszkiewicz, 'Trzy razy uczta', in *Spółeczeństwo Polski średniowiecznej: zbiór studiów*, ed. Stefan Krzysztof Kuczyński, 5 (Warszawa: PWN, 1992), 95-108.
- Jacek Banaszkiewicz, 'Widukind o saskich początkach: Saxo, Turyng i "Landkaufszene" (Res Gestae Saxonicae, I,5). Naśladownictwo antycznych wzorów, stara saga plemienna czy wytwór uczoności saskich intelektualistów IX-X wieku', *SŻ* 42 (2004): 19-35.
- Adolf Bär and Paul Quensel, *Bildersaal Deutscher Geschichte. Zwei Jahrtausende Deutschen Lebens in Bild und Wort* (Stuttgart-Berlin-Leipzig: Union Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1890).
- Richard Barber, 'Why did Edward III Hold the Round Table? The Chivalric Background', in *Edward III's Round Table at Windsor: The House of the Round Table and the Windsor Festival of 1344*, ed. Julian Munby, Richard Barber, and Richard Brown, *Arthurian Studies* 68 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2008), 84-99.
- Julia Barrow, 'Chester's Earliest Regatta? Edgar's Dee-Rowing Revisited', *EME* 10, no. 1 (26 February 2003): 81-93.
- Julia Barrow, 'Demonstrative Behaviour and Political Communication in Later Anglo-Saxon England', *ASE* 36 (2007): 127-50.

- Roland Barthes, *Mitologie*, trans. Adam Dziadek (Warszawa: KR, 2000).
- William Bascom, 'The Forms of Folklore: Prose Narratives', in *Sacred Narrative, Readings in the Theory of Myth*, ed. Alan Dundes (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 5–29.
- Bernd Bastert, 'Heros und Heiliger: Literarische Karlbilder im Mittelalterlichen Frankreich und Deutschland', in *Karl der Grosse und das Erbe der Kulturen*, ed. Franz-Reiner Erkens (Berlin: Akademie, 2001), 197–220.
- Roger A. Beaumont, *The Nazis' March to Chaos: The Hitler Era through the Lenses of Chaos-Complexity Theory* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000).
- Matthias Becher, 'Loyalität oder Opposition?: Die Sachsen und die Thronfolge im Ostfrankenreich (929–939)', in *Zentren herrschaftlicher Repräsentation im Hochmittelalter.*, ed. Caspar Ehlers, Jörg Jarnut, and Matthias Wemhoff, *Deutsche Königspfalzen 7* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 2007), 69–86.
- Matthias Becher, *Otto der Grosse: Kaiser und Reich: Eine Biographie* (München: Beck, 2012).
- Matthias Becher, *Rex, Dux und Gens: Untersuchungen zur Entstehung des sächsischen Herzogtums im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert* (Husum: Matthiesen Verlag, 1996).
- Matthias Becher, 'Von den Karolingern zu den Ottonen. die Königserhebungen von 911 und 919 als Marksteine des Dynastiewechsels im Ostfrankenreich', in *Konrad I. – auf dem Weg zum 'Deutschen Reich'?*, ed. Hans-Werner Goetz (Bochum: Winkler, 2006), 245–64.
- Jean Béranger, 'Le refus du pouvoir (Recherches sur l'aspect idéologique du principat)', *Museum Helveticum: Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Klassische Altertumswissenschaft* 5, no. 3 (1948): 178–96.
- Stefan Berger, 'The Invention of European National Traditions in European Romanticism', in *The Oxford History of Historical Writing*, ed. Stuart Macintyre, Juan Maignushca, and Attila Pók, 4: 1800–1945 (Oxford-New York: OUP, 2011), 19–40.
- Rolf Bergmann, 'Deutsche Sprache und römisches Reich im Mittelalter', in *Heilig – Römisch – Deutsch: das Reich im mittelalterlichen Europa*, ed. Bernd Schneidmüller and Stefan Weinfurter (Dresden: Sandstein, 2006), 162–84.
- John William Bernhardt, *Itinerant Kingship and Royal Monasteries in Early Medieval Germany C. 936 – 1075*, CSMIT Fourth Series 21 (Cambridge: CUP, 1993).
- Walter Berschin, *Greek Letters and the Latin Middle Ages: From Jerome to Nicholas of Cusa*, trans. Jerold C. Frakes, Rev. and expanded ed (Washington, D.C: CUAP, 1988).
- Walter Berschin, 'Realistic Writing in the Tenth Century: Gerhard of Augsburg's Vita (I) S. Uodalrici (A.D. 982–993)', in *Mittellateinische Studien*, by Walter Berschin (Heidelberg: Mattes, 2005), 249–54.
- Gerhard Besier, 'Neo-Pagan Religiosity and Protestantism in the National Socialist State: The Cathedral in Quedlinburg as a Cult and Consecration Site', in *Religion, State and Society in the Transformations of the Twentieth Century: Modernization, Innovation and Decline*, by Gerhard Besier (Berlin-New Brunswick: Lit, 2008), 173–208.
- Helmut Beumann, 'Die sakrale Legitimierung des Herrschers im Denken der Ottonischen Zeit', in *Königswahl und Thronfolge in ottonisch-frühdeutscher Zeit*, ed. Eduard Hlawitschka (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971), 148–98.
- Helmut Beumann, 'Unitas Ecclesiae – Unitas Imperii – Unitas Regni. Von der imperialen Reichseinheitsidee zur Einheit der Regna', in *Nascita dell'Europa de Europa carolingia, un'equazione da verificare: 19-25 aprile 1979.*, Settimane 27 (Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo., 1981), 531–71.
- Helmut Beumann, *Widukind von Korvei, Untersuchungen zur Geschichtsschreibung und Ideengeschichte des 10. Jahrhunderts* (Weimar: H. Böhlhaus Nachfolger, 1950).

- Katharina Bierbrauer, *Die vorkarolingischen und karolingischen Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek*, Katalog der Illuminirten Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek in München 1 (Wiesbaden: L. Reichert, 1990).
- Peter G. Bietenholz, *Historia and Fabula: Myths and Legends in Historical Thought from Antiquity to the Modern Age* (Leiden-New York: Brill, 1994).
- Ivan Biliarsky, 'Old Testament Models and the State in Early Medieval Bulgaria', in *The Old Testament in Byzantium*, ed. Paul Magdalino and Robert S. Nelson, Dumbarton Oaks Byzantine Symposia and Colloquia (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2010), 255–77.
- Marita Blattmann, 'Ein Unglück für Sein Volk'. Der Zusammenhang zwischen Fehlverhalten des Königs und Volkswohl in Quellen des 7.–12. Jahrhunderts', *FMSt* 30 (1996): 80–102.
- John R. E. Bliese, 'Rhetoric and Morale: A study of Battle orations from the Central middle ages', *JMH* 15, no. 3 (1989): 201–26.
- Karen Blough, 'The Lance of St Maurice as a Component of the Early Ottonian Campaign against Paganism: The Lance of St Marice', *EME* 24, no. 3 (August 2016): 338–61.
- Shane Bobrycki, 'Breaking and Making Tradition: Æthelstan, 'Abd-Ar-Rahman III, and Their Panegyrists', in *Every Inch a King: Comparative Studies on Kings and Kingship in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds*, ed. Lynette G. Mitchell and C. P. Melville, Rulers and Elites 2 (Boston: Brill, 2013), 245–67.
- Michail Bojcov, 'Okkasionelles (Reise, Feldzug, Eide, Ständeversammlung, Gastfreundschaft)', in *Höfe und Residenzen im spätmittelalterlichen Reich*, ed. Werner Paravicini, Jan Hirschiegel, and Jörg Wettlaufer, 1, Residenzenforschung 15, II (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2003), 492–95.
- Michail A. Bojcov, 'Der Heilige Kranz und der Heilige Pferdezaum des Kaisers Konstantin und des Bischofs Ambrosius', *FMSt* 42 (2008): 1–69.
- Lothar Bornscheuer, *Miseriae regum; Untersuchungen zum Krisen- und Todesgedanken in den herrschaftstheologischen Vorstellungen der ottonisch-salischen Zeit*. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1968).
- Egon Boshof, 'Die Vorstellung vom sakralen Königtum in karolingisch-ottonischer Zeit', in *das frühmittelalterliche Königtum ideelle und religiöse Grundlagen*, ed. Franz-Reiner Erkens (Berlin-New York: de Gruyter, 2005), 331–58.
- Egon Boshof, *Königtum und Königsherrschaft im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert* (München: Oldenbourg, 1993).
- Constance Brittain Bouchard, *Those of My Blood: Constructing Noble Families in Medieval Francia*, The Middle Ages Series (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001).
- François Bougard, 'La relique au procès: autour des miracles de Saint Colomban', *Actes de La Société des Historiens Médiévistes de l'Enseignement Supérieur Public* 31, no. 1 (2000): 35–66.
- François Bougard, 'MANASSE', in *Dizionario Biografico Degli Italiani*, 68 (Roma: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 2007), 428–32.
- Cornelius Adrianus Bouman, *Sacring and Crowning: The Development of the Latin Ritual for the Anointing of Kings and the Coronation of an Emperor before the Eleventh Century*, Bijdragen van Het Instituut Voor Middeleeuwse Geschiedenis der Rijksuniversiteit Te Utrecht (Groningen, Djakarta: J. B. Wolters, 1957).
- Dominique Boutet, 'Charlemagne dans la littérature des XIIe et XIIIe siècles', in *L'écrivain et le grand homme*, Travaux de littérature 18 (Boulogne: ADIREL. Association pour la diffusion de la recherche littéraire, 2005), 19–31.
- Charles R. Bowlus, *The Battle of Lechfeld and Its Aftermath, August 955: The End of the Age of Migrations in the Latin West* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).
- Edina Bozóky, *La politique des reliques de Constantin à Saint Louis. Protection collective et légitimation du pouvoir*, Bibliothèque Historique et Littéraire (Paris: Beauchesne, 2006).

- Anastasia Brakhman, *Außenseiter und, Insider'. Kommunikation und Historiographie im Umfeld des ottonischen Herrscherhofes*, HS 509 (Husum: Matthiesen Verlag, 2016).
- Todd Breyfogle, 'Citizenship and Signs: Rethinking Augustine on the Two Cities', in *A Companion to Greek and Roman Political Thought*, ed. Ryan K. Balot (Chichester-Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 501–26.
- Bradford B. Broughton, *The Legends of King Richard I Coeur de Lion. A Study of Sources and Variations to the Year 1600* (Hague-Paris: Mouton & co, 1966).
- Elizabeth A. R. Brown, 'Saint-Denis and the Turpin Legend', in *The Codex Calixtinus and the Shrine of St. James*, ed. John Williams and Alison Stones, *Jakobus-Studien* 3 (Tübingen: G. Narr, 1992), 51–88.
- Phyllis Rugg Brown and Stephen L. Wailes, eds., *A Companion to Hrotsvit of Gandersheim* (Fl. 960): *Contextual and Interpretive Approaches*, BCCT 34 (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2012).
- Phyllis Rugg Brown, Katharina M. Wilson, and Linda A. McMillin, eds., *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: Contexts, Identities, Affinities, and Performances* (Toronto-Buffalo: UTP, 2004).
- Leslie Brubaker, *Vision and Meaning in Ninth-Century Byzantium: Image as Exegesis in the Homilies of Gregory of Nazianzus*, *Cambridge Studies in Palaeography and Codicology* 6 (Cambridge-New York: CUP, 1999).
- John Brückmann, 'Latin Manuscript Pontificals and Benedictionals In. England and Wales', *Traditio* 29 (1973): 391–458.
- Carlrichard Brühl, *Deutschland-Frankreich: die Geburt zweier Völker* (Köln: Böhlau, 1995).
- Carlrichard Brühl, 'Kronen- und Krönungsbrauch im Frühen und Hohen Mittelalter', *HZ* 234, no. 1 (1982): 1–31.
- James A. Brundage, '"Cruce Signari": The Rite for Taking the Cross in England', *Traditio* 22 (1966): 289–310.
- Robert Bubczyk, *Gry na szachownicy w kulturze dworskiej i rycerskiej średniowiecznej Anglii na tle europejskim* (Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, 2009).
- Robert Bubczyk, *Szachy i rycerze: o grach planszowych w angielskiej kulturze wyższej późniejszego średniowiecza* (Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, 2005).
- Philippe Buc, 'Italian Hussies and German Matrons. Liutprand Of. Cremona on Dynastic Legitimation', *FMSt* 29 (1995): 207–25.
- Philippe Buc, 'Noch einmal 918-919: Of the ritualized demise of kings and of political rituals in general', in *Zeichen, Rituale, Werte: Internationales Kolloquium des Sonderforschungsbereichs 496 an der Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität Münster*, ed. Gerd Althoff and Christiane Witthöft (Münster: Rhema, 2004), 151–78.
- Philippe Buc, *The Dangers of Ritual: Between Early Medieval Texts and Social Scientific Theory* (Princeton: PUP, 2001).
- Max Buchner, 'Franz Lütke, König Heinrich I. Berlin, Gg. Stilke (1936). 208 S.; Alfred Thoss, Heinrich I (919-936): der Gründer des Ersten Deutschen Volksreiches. Goslar, Blut-Und-Boden-Verlag (1936). 227 S.; ZBL 9 (1936): 457–64.
- Bridget Buxton and Diana E. E. Kleiner, 'Pledges of Empire: The Ara Pacis and the Donations of Rome', *American Journal of Archaeology* 112, no. 1 (1 January 2008): 57–89.
- Johannes Bühler, *Deutsche Geschichte: Urzeit. Bauerntum und Aristokratie bis Um 1100*, *Deutsche Geschichte: Ergänztter Neudruck* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1954).
- Johannes Burkhardt, 'Von der Geschichte zum Mythos. Historische Betrachtungen Deutscher Gelehrter Bei Ausbruch des Ersten Weltkriegs', in *Mythen, Symbole und Rituale: die Geschichtsmächtigkeit der Zeichen in Südosteuropa im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Dittmar Dahlmann and Wilfried Potthoff, *HPZS* 14 (Frankfurt am Main-New York: P. Lang, 2000), 25–36.
- Heinrich Büttner, 'Zur Burgenbauordnung Heinrichs I.', *BfDL* 92 (1956): 1–17.

- Joseph Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (Princeton, N.J.: PUP, 1972).
- Joseph Campbell and Bill D. Moyers, *The Power of Myth* (New York: Broadway Books, 2011).
- Alexander Cartellieri, *Die Weltstellung des Deutschen Reiches 911-1047* (München-Berlin: R. Oldenbourg, 1932).
- Carolyn M. Carty, 'The Role of Medieval Dream Images in Authenticating Ecclesiastical Construction', *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 62, no. 1 (1999): 45–90.
- Błażej Cecota, *Arabskie oblężenia Konstantynopola w VII-VIII wieku: rzeczywistość i mit*, Byzantina Lodziensia, XXI (Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 2016).
- Marek Cetwiński, 'Apoteoza kłęski (Z dziejów mitu legnickiego)', in *Metamorfozy slaskie studia źródłoznawcze i historiograficzne*, by Marek Cetwiński (Częstochowa: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej w Częstochowie, 2002), 153–69.
- William A. Chaney, *The Cult of Kingship in Anglo-Saxon England; the Transition from Paganism to Christianity* (Manchester: MUP, 1970).
- Marjorie Chibnall, *The World of Orderic Vitalis: Norman Monks and Norman Knights* (Rochester: Boydell Press, 1996).
- Paolo Chiesa, 'Così si costruì un mostro. Giovanni XII nella cosiddetta Historia Ottonis di Liutprando di Cremona', *Faventia* 21, no. 1 (1999): 85–102.
- Paolo Chiesa, *Liutprando di Cremona e il codice di Frisinga Clm 6388*, CCAM 1 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1994).
- Paolo Chiesa, 'Sulla presunta autografia di Liutprando nel Clm 6388 e sulla scelta dell'ipotesi più economica in critica testuale', *Revue d'Histoire des Textes* n.s. 1 (2006): 153–72.
- Paolo Chiesa, 'Testi provvisori, varianti d'autore, copie individuali. Il caso dell'Antapodosis di Liutprando', in *La critica del testo mediolatino: atti del convegno: Firenze 6-8 dicembre 1990*, ed. Claudio Leonardi, 1. ed, Biblioteca di 'Medioevo latino' 5 (Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 1994), 323–37.
- Torben Christensen, *Rufinus of Aquileia and the Historia Ecclesiastica, Lib. VIII-IX, of Eusebius*, Historisk-Filosofiske Meddelelser 58 (Copenhagen: Kongelige Danske videnskabernes selskab: Kommissioner, Munksgaard, 1989).
- Neil Christie, *From Constantine to Charlemagne: An Archaeology of Italy, AD 300-800* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).
- Ann Christys, *Christians in Al-Andalus, 711-1000* (Richmond, Surrey: Curzon, 2002).
- Mary Clayton, 'The Old English Promissio Regis', *ASE* 37 (2009): 91–150.
- Norman Cohn, 'Kaiser Friedrich II. Als Messias', in *Stupor Mundi: Zur Geschichte Friedrichs II. von Hohenstaufen*, ed. Gunther G. Wolf, 2., völlig neubearbeitete Aufl, WdF 101 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982), 268–98.
- Roger Collins, 'Julian of Toledo and the Royal Succession in Late Seventh-Century Spain', in *Early Medieval Kingship*, ed. Peter Sawyer and Ian Wood (Leeds: The editors, 1977), 30–49.
- Enza Colonna, 'Figure femminili in Liutprando da Cremona', *Quaderni Medievali* 14 (1982): 29–60.
- Enza Colonna, *Le poesie di Liutprando di Cremona: commento tra testo e contesto* (Bari: Edipuglia, 1996).
- Giles Constable, 'Nona et Decima: An Aspect of Carolingian Economy', *Speculum* 35, no. 2 (1960): 224–50.
- Herbert Edward John Cowdrey, 'The Mahdia Campaign of 1087', *EHR* 92, no. 362 (1977): 1–29.
- Arsenio Crespellani, *Memorie storiche vignolesi pubblicate per cura dell'Avv. Arsenio Crespellani nella fausta circostanza del secondo centenario dalla nascita dell'immortale Ludovico Antonio Muratori* (Modena: Tip-Cappelli, 1872).
- Tom Peete Cross, *Motif-index of Early Irish Literature* (Bloomington (Ind.): Indiana university, 1952).
- Judit Csákó, 'Les Éléments Fabuleux de L'Histoire Hongroise Dans Une Chronique Française Du 13e Siècle. Le Témoignage D'Albéric de Troisfontaines: C'est La Version Abrégée Du Titre on Peut L'Omettre', *Hungarian Studies* 26, no. 1 (1 June 2012): 3–16.

- Catherine R. E. Cubitt, 'Bishops and Succession Crises in Tenth- and Eleventh-Century England', in *Patterns of Episcopal Power Bishops in Tenth and Eleventh Century Western Europe*, ed. Dominik Waßenhoven and Ludger Körntgen (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 111–26.
- Aleksandra Czapelska, 'Aethelstan spadkobiercą Karola Wielkiego? Historia pewnych relikwii', in *Christianitas romana: studia ofiarowane profesorowi Romanowi Michalowskiemu*, ed. Krzysztof Skwirczynski (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 2009), 158–71.
- Gilbert Dagron, *Emperor and Priest: The Imperial Office in Byzantium*, trans. Jean Birrell, Past and Present Publications (Cambridge-New York: CUP, 2007).
- Johanna Dale, 'Imperial Self-Representation and the Manipulation of History in Twelfth-Century Germany: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 373', *GH* 29, no. 4 (1 December 2011): 557–83.
- Zbigniew Dalewski, 'Die Heilige Lanze und die polnischen Insignien', in *Europas Mitte Um 1000*, ed. Alfried Wiczorek and Hans-Martin Hinz, 2 (Stuttgart: Theiss, 2000), 907–11.
- Zbigniew Dalewski, *Ritual and Politics: Writing the History of a Dynastic Conflict in Medieval Poland*, East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 450–1450 3 (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2008).
- Craig R. Davis, 'Cultural Assimilation in the Anglo-Saxon Royal Genealogies', *ASE* 21 (1992): 23–36.
- Hansmartin Decker-Hauff and Percy Ernst Schramm, 'Die Reichskrone, angefertigt für Kaiser Otto I.', in *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik: Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte vom dritten bis zum sechzehnten Jahrhundert*, ed. Percy Ernst Schramm, MGH Schriften 13 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1954), 560–637.
- Josef Deér, 'Byzanz und die Herrschaftszeichen des Abendlandes', *BZ* 50 (1957): 405–36.
- Hans Delbrück, *History of the Art of War, Volume II: Barbarian Invasions*, trans. Walter J. Renfro, Jr. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1990).
- Carla Del Zotto Tozzoli, *Rosvita: la poetessa degli imperatori sassoni* (Milano: Jaca Book, 2009).
- Ferdinand de Mély, 'Reliques de Constantinople', *Revue de l'Art Chrétien* VIII (1897): 1–11; 120–127; 287–302.
- Joseph Depoin, 'La mort du duc Gislebert de Lorraine', *Le Moyen Âge* 20 (1907): 82–86.
- Pablo de la Cruz Díaz Martínez, 'The Theoretical Strength and Practical Weakness of the Visigothic Monarchy of Toledo', in *Rituals of Power: From Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Frans Theuvs and Janet L. Nelson (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2000), 59–93.
- Arthur Diederichs, *Heinrich I. und Otto der Große: die Gründer des Ersten Reiches Deutscher Nation*, Niedersachsen Gestalten und Zeiten 4 (Hannover: Theodor Schulze's Buchhandlung, 1937).
- Adolf Diehl, 'Heiliges Römisches Reich Deutscher Nation', *HZ* 156, no. 3 (1937): 457–84.
- Maximilian Diesenberger, 'Hair, Sacrality and Symbolic Capital in the Frankish Kingdoms', in *The Construction of Communities in the Early Middle Ages: Texts, Resources and Artefacts*, ed. Richard Corradini, Max Diesenberger, and Helmut Reimitz, TRW 12 (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2003), 173–212.
- Peter Dinzelsbacher, *Vision und Visionsliteratur im Mittelalter*, MGM 23 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1981).
- Hellmut Diwald, *Heinrich der Erste: die Gründung des Deutschen Reiches*. (Bergisch Gladbach: Gustav Lübbe, 1990).
- Hellmut Diwald, *Luther: eine Biographie* (Bergisch Gladbach: Lübbe, 1982).
- Hellmut Diwald, *Wallenstein: eine Biographie*, Ungekürzte Ausg., (nach der überarb. Ausg. 1984), Ullstein-Buch Lebensbilder, Nr. 27550 (Frankfurt am Main-Berlin: Ullstein, 1987).
- Andreas Dorpalen, *German History in Marxist Perspective: The East German Approach* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1985).
- James R. Dow and Hannjost Lixfeld, 'National Socialistic Folklore and Overcoming the Past in the Federal Republic of Germany', *Asian Folklore Studies* 50, no. 1 (1991): 117–53.
- James R. Dow and Hannjost Lixfeld, eds., *The Nazification of an Academic Discipline: Folklore in the Third Reich*, Folklore Studies in Translation (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994).

- Wilhelm Dönniges, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter der Herrschaft König und Kaiser Ottos I. von 951 bis 973* (Berlin: Duncker&Humblot, 1839).
- Jan Willem Drijvers, 'Promoting Jerusalem: Cyril and the True Cross', in *Portraits of Spiritual Authority: Religious Power in Early Christianity, Byzantium, and the Christian Orient*, ed. Jan Willem Drijvers and John W. Watt, Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 137 (Boston: Brill, 1999), 79–95.
- Peter Dronke, *Women Writers of the Middle Ages: A Critical Study of Texts from Perpetua to Marguerite Porete* (Cambridge-New York: CUP, 1984).
- Georges Dumézil, *Du mythe au roman: la saga de Hadingus* (Paris: PUF, 1983).
- David N. Dumville, 'The Aetheling: A Study in Anglo-Saxon Constitutional History', *ASE* 8 (1979): 1–33.
- Jean Dunbabin, 'The Distinctive Elements Among Godfrey of Viterbo's Political Ideas', in *Godfrey of Viterbo and His Readers: Imperial Tradition and Universal History in Late Medieval Europe*, ed. Thomas Foerster, Church, Faith and Culture in the Medieval West (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), 37–46.
- Paul Edward Dutton, *The Politics of Dreaming in the Carolingian Empire*, Regents Studies in Medieval Culture (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994).
- Ernst Dümmler and Rudolf Köpke, *Kaiser Otto der Große*, Jahrbücher der Deutschen Geschichte (Leipzig: Duncker&Humblot, 1876).
- Jiří Dynda, 'The Three-Headed One at the Crossroad: A Comparative Study of the Slavic God Triglav', *Studia Mythologica Slavica* 17 (2014): 57–82.
- Hans Eggers, *Deutsche Sprachgeschichte*, 1 (Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1986).
- Joachim Ehlers, *Die Entstehung des Deutschen Reiches* (München: Oldenbourg, 2012).
- Joachim Ehlers, 'Heinrich I. in Quedlinburg', in *Herrschaftsrepräsentation im Ottonischen Sachsen*, ed. Gerd Althoff and Ernst Schubert (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1998), 235–66.
- Joachim Ehlers, *Otto von Freising Ein Intellektueller im Mittelalter* (München: Beck, 2013).
- Thomas Eichenberger, *Patria: Studien zur Bedeutung des Wortes im Mittelalter (6.-12. Jahrhundert)* (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1991).
- Mircea Eliade, *Aspekty mitu*, trans. Piotr Mrówczyński (Warszawa: KR, 1998).
- Mircea Eliade, *The Myth of the Eternal Return: Cosmos and History*, Bollingen Series 46 (Princeton: PUP, 2005).
- Mircea Eliade, *Traktat o historii religii*, trans. Jan Wierusz-Kowalski (Warszawa: Aletheia, 2009).
- Terje Emberland, 'Å stjele norsk bondeblod. Heinrich Himmler, Walther Darré, SS og den norske bonde', *Fortid* 6, no. 2 (2009): 19–28.
- Terje Emberland, 'Pure-Blooded Vikings and Peasants. Norwegians in the Racial Ideology of the SS', in *Racial Science in Hitler's New Europe, 1938-1945*, ed. Rory Yeomans and Anton Weiss-Wendt (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2013), 108–28.
- Dietrich von Engelhardt and Walther Killy, eds., *Deutsche Biographische Enzyklopädie*, 2 (Bohacz-Ebhardt) (München: Saur, 1995).
- Michael J. Enright, *Iona, Tara, and Soissons the Origin of the Royal Anointing Ritual*, Arbeiten zur Frühmittelalterforschung 17 (Berlin-New York: de Gruyter, 1985).
- Siegfried Epperlein, 'Über das Romfreie Kaisertum im Frühen Mittelalter', *Jahrbuch für Geschichte* 2 (1967): 307–42.
- Carl Erdmann, 'Der ungesalbte König', *DAfEM* 2 (1938): 311–40.
- Carl Erdmann, 'Die Burgenordnung Heinrichs I.', *Deutsches Archiv für Geschichte des Mittelalters* 6 (1943): 59–101.
- Karl Dietrich Erdmann, *Toward a Global Community of Historians: The International Historical Congresses and the International Committee of Historical Sciences 1898-2000* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2005).
- Franz-Reiner Erkens, 'Der Herrscher als „gotes drūt“. Zur Sakralität des ungesalbten ostfränkischen Königs', *HJ* 118 (1998): 1–39.

- Franz-Reiner Erkens, *Herrschersakralität im Mittelalter: von den Anfängen bis zum Investiturstreit* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2006).
- Franz-Reiner Erkens, 'Konrad I. als "christus domini"', in *Konrad I. – auf dem Weg zum 'Deutschen Reich'?*, ed. Hans-Werner Goetz (Bochum: Winkler, 2006), 111–28.
- Franz-Reiner Erkens, *Kurfürsten und Königswahl: zu neuen Theorien über den Königswahl-paragraphen im Sachsenspiegel und die Entstehung des Kurfürstenkollegiums*, MGH Studien 30 (Hannover: Hahn, 2002).
- Kasper Risbjerg Eskildsen, 'Leopold Ranke's Archival Turn: Location and Evidence in Modern Historiography', *Modern Intellectual History* 5, no. 3 (2008): 425–53.
- David Evans, 'Agamemnon and the Indo-European Threefold Death Pattern', *History of Religions* 19, no. 2 (1979): 153–66.
- Eugen Ewig, 'Le culte de saint Martin à l'époque franque', *Revue d'Histoire de l'Église de France* 47, no. 144 (1961): 1–18.
- Gustav Faber, *Merowingowie i Karolingowie*, trans. Zbigniew Jaworski (Warszawa: PIW, 1994).
- Michael Fahlbusch, *Wissenschaft im Dienst der nationalsozialistischen Politik?: die 'Volksdeutschen Forschungsgemeinschaften' von 1931-1945*, (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1999).
- Wojciech Fałkowski, 'Double Meaning in Ritual Communication', *FMSSt* 42 (2008): 169–87.
- Gina Fasoli, *Ire d'Italia (888-962)* (Firenze: G. C. Sansoni, 1949).
- Hans Constantin Faußner, 'Die staatsrechtliche Grundlage des Rex Francorum', *ZSSR-GA* 103 (1986): 42–103.
- Michael J. Featherstone, 'The Chrysotriklinos Seen through "De Cerimoniis"', in *Zwischen Polis, Provinz und Peripherie: Beiträge zur Byzantinischen Geschichte und Kultur*, ed. Lars Martin Hoffmann and Anuscha Monchizadeh (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2005), 845–52.
- Michael J. Featherstone, 'The Great Palace as Reflected in the De Cerimoniis', in *Visualisierungen von Herrschaft: Frühmittelalterliche Residenzen: Gestalt und Zeremoniell: Internationales Kolloquium 3./4. Juni 2004 in Istanbul*, ed. Franz Alto Bauer, Byzas 5 (Istanbul: Ege Yayınları, 2006), 47–61.
- Michael J. Featherstone, 'Space and Ceremony in the Great Palace of Constantinople under the Macedonian Dynasty', in *Le Corti nell'Alto Medioevo, Spoleto 24-29 Aprile 2014*, Settimane 62 (Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 2015), 587–610.
- Heinrich Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century: Mentalities and Social Orders*, trans. Patrick J. Geary (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993).
- Heinrich Fichtenau, 'Zum Reliquienwesen im Frühen Mittelalter', *MIÖG* 60 (1952): 60–89.
- Karol Fiedor, *Bund Deutscher Osten w systemie antypolskiej propagandy* (Warszawa-Wrocław: PWN, 1977).
- Albrecht Finck von Finckenstein, *Bischof und Reich: Untersuchungen zum Integrationsprozess des ottonisch-frühsalischen Reiches (919-1056)* (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1989).
- Egon Flaig, 'Wie im Westen des Imperium ein neues politisches System entstand: nach 390', in *Die Macht des Königs: Herrschaft in Europa vom Frühmittelalter bis in die Neuzeit*, ed. Bernhard Jussen (München: Beck, 2005), 1–13.
- Josef Fleckenstein, 'Das Reich der Ottonen im 10. Jahrhundert', in *Gebhardt. Handbuch der Deutschen Geschichte*, ed. Herbert Grundmann, 1 (Stuttgart: Union Verlag, 1981), 217–83.
- Amalie Föbel, *Die Königin im mittelalterlichen Reich: Herrschaftsausübung, Herrschaftsrechte, Handlungsspielräume*, Mittelalter-Forschungen 4 (Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2000).
- Michael Frase, *Friede und Königsherrschaft: Quellenkritik und Interpretation der Continuatio Reginonis: (Studien zur Ottonischen Geschichtsschreibung)*, Studia Irenica 35 (Frankfurt am Main-New York: P. Lang, 1990).

- Bele Freudenberg, 'Darstellungsmuster und Typen von Zorn in der Historiographie. die "Antapodosis" Liudprands von Cremona', *das Mittelalter. Perspektiven Mediävistischer Forschung* 14, no. 1 (2009): 80–97.
- Johannes Fried, 'Can Neuro-Biology Help Us to Understand History?', in *Beyond Science in Historical Theory*, ed. Irmeline Veit-Brause (Milano: Jaca Book, 2005), 27–37.
- Johannes Fried, 'Die Königserhebung Heinrichs I. Erinnerung, Mündlichkeit und Traditionsbildung im 10. Jahrhundert', *HZ Beihefte* 20 (1 January 1995): 267–318.
- Johannes Fried, 'Karl der Grosse. Geschichte und Mythos', in *Mythen Europas: Schlüsselfiguren der Imagination*, ed. Michael Neumann and Inge B. Milfull, 2: Mittelalter (Regensburg: F. Pustet, 2004), 14–47.
- Johannes Fried, *Otto III. und Boleslaw Chrobry: das Widmungsbild des Aachener Evangelists, der 'Akt von Gnesen' und das frühe polnische und ungarische Königtum* (Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 2001).
- Johannes Fried, *The Veil of Memory: Anthropological Problems when Considering the Past* (London: German Historical Institute, 1998).
- Johannes Fried, *Zu Gast im Mittelalter* (München: Beck, 2007).
- Udo Friedrich, *Menschen und Tiernatur: Diskurse der Grenzziehung und Grenzüberschreitung im Mittelalter*, Historische Semantik 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009).
- Heinz-Werner Friese, 'Das Bild Ottos des Großen in der Deutschen Geschichtsschreibung des Mittelalters von 950–1250' (unpublished Ph.D., Martin Luther Universität Halle–Wittenberg, 1939).
- Anatole Frolov, 'La Vraie Croix et les expéditions d'Héraclius en Perse', *Revue des Études Byzantines* 11 (1953): 88–105.
- Horst Fuhrmann, 'Die Synode von Hohenaltheim (916) – Quellenkundlich Betrachtet', *DAfEM* 43 (1987): 440–68.
- Matthew Gabriele, *An Empire of Memory: The Legend of Charlemagne, the Franks, and Jerusalem before the First Crusade* (Oxford–New York: OUP, 2011).
- Helena M. Gamer, 'The Earliest Evidence of Chess in Western Literature: The Einsiedeln Verses', *Speculum* 29, no. 4 (1 October 1954): 734–50.
- Germana Gandino, *Contemplare l'ordine: intellettuali e potenti dell'alto Medioevo* (Napoli: Liguori, 2004).
- Germana Gandino, *Il vocabolario politico e sociale di Liutprando di Cremona*, Nuovi Studi Storici 27 (Roma: Istituto storico per il medio evo, 1995).
- Ildar H. Garipzanov, *The Symbolic Language of Authority in the Carolingian World (C. 751–877)*, Brill's Series on the Early Middle Ages 16 (Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2008).
- Claudia Garnier, *Die Kultur der Bitte: Herrschaft und Kommunikation im mittelalterlichen Reich* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2008).
- Mary Garrison, 'Letters to a King and Biblical Exempla: The Examples of Cathulf and Clemens Peregrinus', *EME* 7, no. 3 (26 February 2003): 305–28.
- Mary Garrison, 'The Franks as the New Israel? Education for an Identity from Pippin to Charlemagne', in *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Yitzhak Hen and Matthew Innes (Cambridge–New York: CUP, 2000), 114–61.
- Valerie L. Garver, *Women and Aristocratic Culture in the Carolingian World* (Ithaca: CorUP, 2009).
- Stefano Gasparri, 'Kingship Rituals in Lombard Italy', in *Rituals of Power: From Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Frans Theuvs and Janet L. Nelson (Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2000), 95–114.
- Simon Gaunt, *Troubadours and Irony* (Cambridge: CUP, 2008).
- Wanda Gawłowska, *Frutolfa z Michelsbergu 'Chronicon Universale': Wątki dziejopisarskie i literackie* (Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 1989).
- Maja Jowita Gąssowska, 'Rozwój kultu św. Eryka w średniowiecznej Szwecji', *KH* 100, no. 1 (1993): 3–27.
- Patrick J. Geary, *Furta Sacra: Thefts of Relics in the Central Middle Ages*, Rev. ed, Princeton Paperbacks (Princeton: PUP, 1990).

- Patrick J. Geary, *Living with the Dead in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca: CorUP, 1994).
- Shami Ghosh, *Kings' Sagas and Norwegian History: Problems and Perspectives*, The Northern World: North Europe and the Baltic C. 400-1700 A.D.: Peoples, Economies and Cultures 54 (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2011).
- Wolfgang Giese, *Der Stamm der Sachsen und das Reich in Ottonischer und Salischer Zeit: Studien zum Einfluss D. Sachsenstammes Auf D. Polit. Geschichte D. Dt. Reichs im 10. U. 11. Jh. U. Zu Ihrer Stellung im Reichsgefüge Mit E. Ausblick Auf D. 12. U. 13. Jh* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1979).
- Wolfgang Giese, 'Designative Nachfolgeregelungen im Regnum Italiae (891-950)', *DAfEM* 68, no. 2 (2012): 505–17.
- Wolfgang Giese, 'Designative Nachfolgeregelungen in Germanischen Reichen der Völkerwanderungszeit', *ZSSR-GA* 117 (2000): 39–121.
- Wolfgang Giese, 'Die Designativen Nachfolgeregelungen der Karolinger 714-979', *DAfEM* 64 (2008): 437–511.
- Wolfgang Giese, 'Ensis sine capulo. der ungesalbte König Heinrich I. und die an ihm geübte Kritik', in *Festschrift für Eduard Hlawitschka: zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Eduard Hlawitschka, Karl Rudolf Schnith, and Roland Pauler, Münchener historische Studien, Abteilung Mittelalterliche Geschichte 5 (Kallmünz Opf.: Lassleben, 1993), 151–64.
- Wolfgang Giese, *Heinrich I.: Begründer der ottonischen Herrschaft* (Darmstadt: WBG, 2008).
- Wolfgang Giese, 'Untersuchungen zur Herrschaftsnachfolge in Langobardischen Herzog- und Fürstentümern vom 7. bis Ins 11. Jahrhundert. Mit Einem Exkurs Über Designation und Mitherrschaft in Den Herzogtümern Bayern, Schwaben und Lothringen (Anfang 8. Jahrhundert-1040)', *ZSSR-GA* 119 (2002): 44–77.
- Wolfgang Giese, 'Zu den Designationen und Mitkönigserhebungen der deutschen Könige des Hochmittelalters (936-1237)', *ZSSR-GA* 92 (1973): 174–83.
- John Gillingham, 'Fontenoy and after: Pursuing Enemies to Death in France between the Ninth and Eleventh Centuries', in *Frankland: The Franks and the World of the Early Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of Dame Jinty Nelson*, ed. Paul Fouracre and David Ganz (Manchester: MUP, 2008), 242–65.
- Marco Giovini, 'I viaggi a Costantinopoli di Liutprando da Cremona fra professione storiografica e spunti terenziani', *Studi Medievali. 3a Serie* 46 (2005): 753–81.
- Marco Giovini, 'L'Antapodosis di Liutprando da Cremona alla luce delle riprese terenziane', *Maia: Rivista Di Letterature Classiche* 53 (2001): 137–66.
- Marco Giovini, 'Papa Giovanni XII fra l'innamorato Chaerea e il monstrum Crispino nella Historia Ottonis di Liutprando', *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 19, no. 1 (2001): 105–23.
- Marco Giovini, 'Percorsi di lettura nell'Antapódosis di Liutprando da Cremona', *Res Publica Litterarum* 20 (1997): 95–122.
- Tibor Glant, 'The War for Wilson's Ear: Austria-Hungary in Wartime American Propaganda', *Hungarian Studies Review* XX, no. 1–2 (1993): 25–51.
- Hans-Werner Goetz, 'Die „deutschen Stämme“ Als Forschungsproblem', in *Zur Geschichte Der Gleichung 'germanisch – Deutsch'*, ed. Heinrich Beck et al., Reallexikon Der Germanischen Altertumskunde – Ergänzungsbände 34 (Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2004), 229–253.
- Hans-Werner Goetz, '"Gens": Terminology and Perception of the "Germanic" Peoples from Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages', in *The Construction of Communities in the Early Middle Ages: Texts, Resources and Artefacts*, ed. Richard Corradini, Max Diesenberger, and Helmut Reimitz, TRW 12 (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2003), 39–64.
- Hans-Werner Goetz, 'Spielregeln, Politische Rituale und Symbolische Kommunikation in der Merowingerzeit. das Beispiel Gregors von Tours', in *Spielregeln der Mächtigen: Mittelalterliche Politik Zwischen Gewohnheit und Konvention*, ed. Claudia Garnier and Hermann Kamp, (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2009), 33–59.

- Eric J. Goldberg, "More Devoted to the Equipment of Battle Than the Splendor of Banquets": Frontier Kingship, Martial Ritual, and Early Knighthood at the Court of Louis the German', *Viator* 30 (1999): 41–78.
- Eric Joseph Goldberg, *Struggle for Empire: Kingship and Conflict under Louis the German, 817–876*, Conjunctions of Religion and Power in the Medieval Past (Ithaca: CorUP, 2006).
- Knut Görich, *Otto III., Romanus Saxonicus et Italicus: kaiserliche Rompolitik und sächsische Historiographie* (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1993).
- Linda Gowans, *Cei and the Arthurian Legend*, *Arthurian Studies* 18 (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1988).
- André Grabar, *L'empereur dans l'art byzantin* (Strasbourg: Les Belles lettres, 1936).
- Antoni Grabowski, 'Author's Annotations: Liudprand of Cremona, His Greek and Clm. 6388', *Viator* 48, no. 2 (2017).
- Antoni Grabowski, 'From Castration to Misogyny. The Meaning of Liudprand of Cremona's Humour', *APH* 112, no. 2 (2015): 243–67.
- Antoni Grabowski, 'Liudprand of Cremona's *Papa Monstrum*: The Image of Pope John XII in the *Historia Ottonis*: The Image of Pope John in the *Historia Ottonis*', *EME* 23, no. 1 (February 2015): 67–92.
- Antoni Grabowski, 'Liudprand z Cremony – „pierwszy Europejczyk” i jego ojczyzna: Królestwo Italii', in *Symboliczne i realne podstawy tożsamości społecznej w średniowieczu*, ed. Sławomir Gawlas and Paweł Żmudski (Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 2017), 486–502.
- Antoni Grabowski, 'Ostatnie studia o Liudprandzie z Cremony', *SŻ* 51 (2013): 93–103.
- Antoni T. Grabowski, '„Duel” between Henry I and Arnulf of Bavaria according to Liudprand of Cremona', in *Konfliktbewältigung und Friedensstiftung im Mittelalter = Przewyciężanie konfliktów i ustanawianie pokoju w średniowieczu*, ed. Roman Czaja, Eduard Mühle, and Andrzej Radziminski (Toruń: Towarzystwo Naukowe w Toruniu, 2012), 387–400.
- Antoni T. Grabowski, 'Wizje początku Niemiec', in *Spór o początki państwa polskiego: historiografia, tradycja, mit, propaganda*, ed. Wojciech Drelicharz, Dariusz Jasiak, and Jacek Poleski, (Kraków: Historia Iagellonica, 2017), 191–97.
- Arturo Graf, *Roma nella memoria e nelle immaginazioni del medio evo*, 2 (Torino: Erimanno Loescher, 1883).
- Michael Grant, *Mity rzymskie*, trans. Zygmunt Kubiak (Warszawa: PIW, 1978).
- František Graus, *Volk, Herrscher und Heiliger im Reich der Merowinger: Studien zur Hagiographie der Merowingerzeit* (Praha: NČSAV, 1965).
- Dennis Howard Green, *Medieval Listening and Reading: The Primary Reception of German Literature, 800–1300* (Cambridge: CUP, 1994).
- Joël H. Grisward, *Archéologie de l'épopée médiévale. Structures trifonctionnelles et mythes indo-européens dans le cycle des Narbonnais*, Bibliothèque Historique (Paris: Payot, 1981).
- Simon Groth, *In regnum successit: 'Karolinger' und 'Ottonen' oder das 'Ostfränkische Reich'?*, Studien zur europäischen Rechtsgeschichte 304 (Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 2017).
- Ryszard Grzesik, *Kronika węgiersko-polska: z dziejów polsko-węgierskich kontaktów kulturalnych w średniowieczu*, Prace Komisji Historycznej, 56 (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskiego Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk, 1999).
- Heinrich Günter, *Das Deutsche Mittelalter*, 1 (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1936).
- Heinrich Günter, *Kaiser Otto der Grosse* (Stuttgart – Berlin: Kohlhammer, 1941).
- Ingo Haar, *Historiker im Nationalsozialismus: Deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft und der 'Volkskumampf' im Osten*, 2. durchgesehene und verb. Aufl, Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft 143 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 2002).
- Lihi Habas, 'The Imperial Sculpture Workshops: The Origin of Images of Children in the Depiction of the Exodus on Early Christian Sarcophagi', in *SOMA 2010: Proceedings of 14th Symposium on Mediterranean Archaeology: Taras Shevchenko National University of Kiev, Kiev, Ukraine*,

- 23-25 April 2010, ed. Yana Morozova and Hakan Oniz, BAR International Series 2555 (Oxford: Archaeopress, 2013), 51–63.
- Frank Hadler, 'Der Magna-Moravia-Mythos Zwischen Geschichtsschreibung und Politik im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert', in *Geschichtliche Mythen in Den Literaturen und Kulturen Ostmittel- und Südosteuropas*, ed. Eva Behring, Ludwig Richter, and Wolfgang Friedrich Schwarz, Forschungen zur Geschichte und Kultur des Östlichen Mitteleuropa 6 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1999), 275–91.
- Albrecht Hagenlocher, *Der 'guote vride': idealer Friede in deutscher Literatur bis ins frühe 14. Jahrhundert* (Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1992).
- Peter Haidu, *Aesthetic Distance in Chretien de Troyes; Irony and Comedy in Cligès and Perceval* (Genève: Librairie Droz, 1968).
- Janina Hajduk-Nijakowska, 'Proces mityzacji współczesnych bohaterów', in *Mit, Prawda, Imaginacja*, ed. Piotr Kowalski, Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis, no 3310 (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2011), 213–32.
- John F. Haldon, *Warfare, State, and Society in the Byzantine World, 565-1204*, Warfare and History (London: UCL Press, 1999).
- Uta Halle, '936 Begräbnis Heinrichs I. – 1936 die Archäologische Suche Nach Den Gebeinen in Quedlinburg und die NS-Propaganda.', *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Archäologie des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit* 16 (2005): 15–21.
- A. Harbus, *Helena of Britain in Medieval Legend* (Suffolk: D.S. Brewer, 2002).
- Andreas Hartmann, *Zwischen Relikt und Reliquie: Objektbezogene Erinnerungspraktiken in Antiken Gesellschaften*, Studien zur Alten Geschichte 11 (Berlin: Verlag Antike, 2010).
- Wilfried Hartmann, 'König Konrad I. und die Kirche.', in *Konrad I. – auf dem Weg zum 'Deutschen Reich'?*, ed. Hans-Werner Goetz (Bochum: Winkler, 2006), 93–109.
- John L. Harvey, 'Hans Rothfels and the Paradoxes of Cosmopolitan Conservatism', in *German Scholars in Exile: New Studies in Intellectual History*, ed. Axel Fair-Schulz and Mario Kessler (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2011), 51–83.
- Karl Hauck, 'Erzbischof Adalbert von Magdeburg als Geschichtsschreiber. Mit der Mitteilung von der mikrochemischen Analyse der Heiligen Lanze in Wien von H. MALISSA', in *Festschrift für Walter Schlesinger.*, ed. Helmut Beumann, 2 (Köln: Böhlau, 1974), 276–353.
- Karl Hauck, 'Halsring und Ahnenstab als herrscherliche Würdezeichen', in *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik: Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte vom dritten bis zum sechzehnten Jahrhundert*, ed. Percy Ernst Schramm, MGH Schriften 13 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1954), 145–212.
- Karl Hauck, 'Rituelle Speisegemeinschaft im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert', *Studium Generale* 3 (1950): 611–21.
- Günter Härtung, 'Völkische Ideologie', in *Handbuch zur 'Völkischen Bewegung' 1871-1918*, ed. Uwe Puschner, Walter Schmitz, and Justus H. Ulbricht (München New Providence London Paris: K.G. Saur, 1996), 22–41.
- Thomas F. Head, 'Postscript: The Ambiguous Bishop', in *The Bishop Reformed: Studies of Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages*, ed. John S. Ott and Anna Trumbore Jones, Church, Faith, and Culture in the Medieval West (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 250–64.
- Werner Hechberger, 'Die Theorie vom Adelsheil im Früheren Mittelalter', in *das Frühmittelalterliche Königtum: Ideelle und Religiöse Grundlagen*, ed. Franz-Reiner Erkens (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005), 427–45.
- Marie-Luise Heckmann, 'Der Fall Formosus. Ungerechtfertigte Anklage gegen einen Toten, Leichenfrevl oder inszenierte Entheiligung des Sakralen?', in *Päpstliche Herrschaft im Mittelalter: Funktionsweisen – Strategien – Darstellungsformen.*, ed. Stefan Weinfurter (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2012), 223–38.
- Peter Heehs, 'Myth, History, and Theory', *History and Theory* 33, no. 1 (1 February 1994): 1–19.
- Ernst-Dieter Hehl, 'Kaisertum, Rom und Papstbezug im Zeitalter Ottos I', in *Ottotonische Neuanfänge. Symposion zur Ausstellung 'Otto der Große, Magdeburg und Europa'*, ed. Bernd Schneidmüller and Stefan Weinfurter (Mainz: von Zabern, 2001), 213–35.

- Hermann Heimpel, 'Bemerkungen zur Geschichte König Heinrichs des Ersten', in *Königswahl und Thronfolge in ottonisch-frühdeutscher Zeit*, ed. Eduard Hlawitschka (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971), 1–45.
- Manfred Hellmann, 'Die Synode von Hohenaltheim (916). Bemerkungen Über das Verhältnis von Königtum und Kirche im Ostfränkischen Reich Zu Beginn des 10. Jahrhunderts', *HJ* 73 (1953): 127–41.
- Frank Helzel, *Deutsche Bevölkerungsfantasien und Lebensraumansprüche im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert im Vergleich – Zwischen Allmachtswahn und Untergangsstimmung* (Bad Wildungen, 2012).
- Frank Helzel, *Ein König, ein Reichsführer und der wilde Osten: Heinrich I. (919–936) in der nationalen Selbstwahrnehmung der Deutschen* (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2004).
- Frank Helzel, *Himmels und Hitlers Symbolpolitik Mit Mittelalterlichen Herrschern – König Heinrich I. (919–936) und Kaiser Otto I. (936–973) in Ihren Nationalgeschichtlichen Rollen im Schlussteil des Zweiten Dreißigjährigen Kriegs 1914–1945* (Bad Wildungen, 2011).
- Frank Helzel, *Notiz zu Hitlers militärischer Weisung Nr. 1 („Unternehmen Otto“) zum „Anschluss“ Österreichs 1938* (Bad Wildungen, 2016).
- Jessica Hemming, 'Sellam gestare: Saddle-Bearing Punishments and the Case of Rhiannon', *Viator* 28 (1997): 45–64.
- Michael W. Herren, 'Aldhelm the Theologian', in *Latin Learning and English Lore. Studies in Anglo-Saxon Literature for Michael Lapidge*, ed. Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe and Andy Orchard, 1 (Toronto: UTP, 2005), 68–89.
- Michael W. Herren and Shirley Ann Brown, *Christ in Celtic Christianity: Britain and Ireland from the Fifth to the Tenth Century*, Studies in Celtic History 20 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2002).
- Paul Herrmann, *Die Heldensagen des Saxo Grammaticus Erläuterungen zu den Ersten Neun Büchern der Dänischen Geschichte des Saxo Grammaticus*, 2 (Leipzig: W. Engelmann, 1922).
- Heinrich Himmler, *Rede des Reichsführer-SS im Dom Zu Quedlinburg. Am 2. Juli 1936* (Berlin: Nordland-Verlag, 1936).
- Ivan Hlaváček, 'Die böhmische Kurwürde in der Premyslidenzeit', in *Königliche Tochterstämme, Königswähler und Kurfürsten*, ed. Armin Wolf, Studien zur Europäischen Rechtsgeschichte 152 (Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 2002), 79–106.
- Eduard Hlawitschka, *Konradiner-Genealogie, unstatthafte Verwandtenehen und spätottonisch-frühsalische Thronbesetzungspraxis: ein Rückblick auf 25 Jahre Forschungsdisput*, MGH Studien 32 (Hannover: Hahn, 2003).
- Eduard Hlawitschka, *Lotharingen und das Reich an der Schwelle der Deutschen Geschichte*, MGH Schriften 21 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1968).
- Jesko von Hoegen, *Der Held von Tannenberg: Genese und Funktion des Hindenburg-Mythos*, Stuttgarter Historische Forschungen 4 (Köln: Böhlau, 2007).
- Hartmut Hoffmann, 'Autographa des Früheren Mittelalters', *DAfEM* 57 (2001): 1–62.
- Hartmut Hoffmann, 'Notare, Kanzler und Bischöfe Am Ottonischen Hof', *DAfEM* 61 (2005): 435–80.
- Tobias Hoffmann, 'Diplomatie in der Krise. Liutprand von Cremona Am Hofe Nikephoros II. Phokas', *FMS* 43 (2009): 113–78.
- Werner Hoffmann, 'Das Hildebrandslied und die indogermanischen Vater-Sohn-Kampf-Dichtungen', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache und Literatur (PBB)* 1970, no. 92 (1970): 26–42.
- Adolf Hofmeister, *Die heilige Lanze, ein Abzeichen des alten Reichs* (Breslau: M u. H Marcus, 1908).
- Robert Holtzmann, *Geschichte der Sächsischen Kaiserzeit, 900–1024* (München: G.D.W. Callwey, 1941).
- Robert Holtzmann, *Kaiser Otto der Grosse* (Berlin: Bondi, 1936).
- Walther Holtzmann, *König Heinrich I. und die Hl. Lanze. Kritische Untersuchungen zur Außenpolitik in Den Anfängen des Deutschen Reiches* (Bonn: Universitäts-Verlag, 1947).
- Ludwig Holzfurtner, *Gloriosus dux: Studien zu Herzog Arnulf von Bayern (907–937)*, Zeitschrift zur bayerischen Landesgeschichte; series B 25 (München: Beck, 2003).

- M.T.G. Humphreys, *Law, Power, and Imperial Ideology in the Iconoclast Era, c.680-850*, Oxford Studies in Byzantium (Oxford: OUP, 2015).
- Wolfgang Huschner, 'Memleben. Königspfalz-Reichskloster-Propstei', Hrsg. von Helge Wittmann', *SACHSEN UND ANHALT Jahrbuch der Historischen Kommission für Sachsen-Anhalt* 24 (2003 2002): 466–70.
- Wolfgang Huschner, *Transalpine Kommunikation im Mittelalter*, MGH Schriften 52 (Hannover: Hahn, 2003).
- George G. Iggers, 'Nationalism and Historiography, 1789-1996. The German Example in Historical Perspective', in *Writing National Histories: Western Europe since 1800*, ed. Stefan Berger, Mark Donovan, and Kevin Passmore (London: Routledge, 1999), 15–29.
- George G. Iggers, *The German Conception of History: The National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present*, (Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1983).
- George G. Iggers, 'The Intellectual Foundations of Nineteenth-Century "Scientific" History: The German Model' in *The Oxford History of Historical Writing*, ed. Stuart Macintyre, Juan Maiguashca, and Attila Pók, 4: 1800–1945 (Oxford-New York: OUP, 2011), 41–58.
- Matthew Innes, 'People, Places and Power in Carolingian Society', in *Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Francs Theuws, Mayke De Jong, and Carine van Rhijn, TRW 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 397–437.
- Matthew Innes, *State and Society in the Early Middle Ages: The Middle Rhine Valley, 400-1000*, CSMLT Fourth Series 47 (Cambridge: CUP, 2000).
- Benjamin H. Isaac, *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity* (Princeton: PUP, 2006).
- Giovanni Isabella, 'Das Sakralkönigtum in Quellen aus Ottonischer Zeit: Unmittelbarer Bezug zu Gott oder Vermittlung durch die Bischöfe?', *FMS* 44 (2010): 137–52.
- Dirk Jäckel, *Der Herrscher als Löwe: Ursprung und Gebrauch eines politischen Symbols im Früh- und Hochmittelalter* (Köln: Böhlau, 2006).
- C. Stephen Jaeger, 'Origins of Courtliness after 25 Years', *HSJ* 21 (2009): 187–216.
- C. Stephen Jaeger, *The Origins of Courtliness: Civilizing Trends and the Formation of Courtly Ideals, 939-1210* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985).
- Neil Jamieson, "'Sons of Iniquity": The Problem of Unlawfulness and Criminality amongst Professional Soldiers in the Middle Ages', in *Outlaws in Medieval and Early Modern England: Crime, Government and Society, c.1066-c.1600*, ed. Paul Dalton and John C. Appleby (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), 91–110.
- Tore Janson, *Prose Rhythm in Medieval Latin from the 9th to the 13th Century* (Stockholm: Almqvist&Wiksell, 1975).
- Tomasz Jasiński, 'Zagadnienie autorstwa Rocznika Obcego. Przyczynę do dziejów historiografii niemieckiej X stulecia', *Roczniki Historyczne* 68 (2002): 7–25.
- Kurt Villads Jensen, 'Sacralization of the Landscape: Converting Trees and Measuring Land in the Danish Crusades against the Wends', in *The Clash of Cultures on the Medieval Baltic Frontier*, ed. Anne Huijbers (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), 141–50.
- Eric John, 'King Edgar's Coronation', in *Orbis Britanniae and Other Studies*, by Eric John (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1966), 276–89.
- Arthur Johnston, 'Pro-German Irish Propaganda', *The High School Journal* 2, no. 4 (1 April 1919): 104–20.
- Adrienne Jones, 'The Significance of the Regal Consecration of Edgar in 973', *JEH* 33, no. 03 (1982): 375–90.
- Mayke de Jong, 'Adding Insult to Injury: Julian of Toledo and his "Historia Wambae"', in *The Visigoths from the Migration Period to the Seventh Century an Ethnographic Perspective*, ed. Peter J. Heather (Woodbridge: Boydell Press; Center for Interdisciplinary Research on Social Stress, 1999), 373–402.

- Mayke de Jong, 'The Empire as Ecclesia: Hranbanus Maurus and Biblical Historia for Rulers', in *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Yitzhak Hen and Matthew Innes (Cambridge: CUP, 2000), 191–226.
- Karl Jordan, 'III. Deutsches Reich und Kaisertum. Anfänge und Aufstieg bis zum Beginn des Investiturstreits', in *Handbuch der Deutschen Geschichte Band 1: Deutsche Geschichte bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters*, ed. Leo Just (Konstanz: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion Dr. Aöbert Hachfeld, 1957), 1–68.
- Susanne Kaeding, Kerstin Seidel, and Britta Kümmerlen, 'Heinrich I. – Ein Freundschaftskönig?', *Concilium Medii Aevi* 3 (2000): 265–326.
- Hans-Dietrich Kahl, 'Einige Beobachtungen zum Sprachgebrauch von Natio im Mittelalterlichen Latein. Mit Ausblicken Auf das Neuhochdeutsche Fremdwort "Nation"', in *Aspekte der Nationenbildung im Mittelalter: Ergebnisse d. Marburger Rundgespräche 1972-1975*, ed. Helmut Beumann and Werner Schröder, *Nationes* 1 (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1978), 63–108.
- Howard Kaminsky, 'Spielregeln der Politik im Mittelalter: Kommunikation in Frieden und Fehde. by Gerd Althoff', *Speculum* 74, no. 3 (1 July 1999): 687–89.
- Hermann Kamp, 'Konflikte und Konfliktführung in den Anfängen der Regierung Ottos I.', in *Otto der Grosse: Magdeburg und Europa*, ed. Matthias Puhle, 1 (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2001), 168–78.
- Sa-Moon Kang, *Divine War in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East* (Berlin-New York: de Gruyter, 1989).
- Bernd Kannowski, 'The Impact of Lineage and Family Connections on Succession in Medieval Germany's Elective Kingdom', in *Making and Breaking the Rules: Succession in Medieval Europe, c.1000-c.1600: Proceedings of the Colloquium Held on 6-7-8 April 2006, Institute of Historical Research, University of London = Établir et Abolir Les Normes: La Succession Dans l'Europe Médiévale, Vers 1000-Vers 1600: Actes de La Conférence Tenue Les 6, 7 et 8 Avril 2006*, ed. Frédérique Lachaud and Michael A. Penman, *Histoires de Famille. La Parenté Au Moyen Age* 9 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), 13–22.
- Ernst Kantorowicz, *Laudes Regiae. A Study in Liturgical Acclamations and Mediaeval Ruler Worship*, University of California Publications in History 33 (Berkeley, 1958).
- Ernst Karpf, *Herrscherlegitimation und Reichsbegriff in der ottonischen Geschichtsschreibung des 10. Jahrhunderts* (Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 1985).
- Ernst Karpf, 'Königerhebung ohne Salbung. Zur politischen Bedeutung von Heinrichs I. ungewöhnlichem Verzicht in Fritzlar (919)', *Hessisches Jahrbuch für Landesgeschichte* 34 (1984): 1–24.
- Ernst Karpf, 'Von Widukinds Sachsengeschichte bis zu Thietmars Chronicon. Zu den literarischen Folgen des politischen Aufschwungs im ottonischen Sachsen', in *Angli e Sassoni al di qua e al di là del mare*, *Settimane* 32 (Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1985), 547–80.
- Ernst Karpf, 'Lechfeld, Schlacht auf dem', in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, 7 (München-Zürich: Artemis; Lexma; J. B. Metzler, 1995), 1786.
- Michael H. Kater, *Das 'Ahnenerbe' der SS 1935-1945: ein Beitrag zur Kulturpolitik des Dritten Reiches* (München: R. Oldenbourg, 1997).
- Hagen Keller, 'Das Kaisertum Ottos des Großen im Verständnis seiner Zeit', *DAfEM* 20 (1964): 325–88.
- Hagen Keller, 'Machabaeorum Pugnae. Zum Stellenwert eines biblischen Vorbilds in Widukinds Deutung der ottonischen Königsherrschaft', in *Iconologia Sacra. Mythos, Bildkunst und Dichtung in der Religions- und Sozialgeschichte Alteuropas. Festschrift für Karl Hauck zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. Hagen Keller (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994), 417–37.
- Hagen Keller, 'Otto der Große urkundet im Bodenseegebiet. Inszenierungen der "Gegenwart des Herrschers" in einer vom König selten besuchten Landschaft', in *Mediaevalia Augiensia*, ed. Jürgen Petersohn (Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2001), 205–46.
- Hagen Keller, 'Reichsstruktur und Herrschaftsauffassung in ottonisch- frühsalischer Zeit', *FMSt* 16 (1982): 74–128.

- Hagen Keller, 'Widukinds Bericht Über die Aachener Wahl und Krönung Ottos I.', *FMSt* 29 (1995): 390–453.
- Karina Kellermann, 'Lückenbüßer? "De Heinrich" im Geflecht spätottonischer Repräsentationszeugnisse', in *Figuren der Ordnung: Beiträge zu Theorie und Geschichte literarischer Dispositionsmuster: Festschrift für Ulrich Ernst*, ed. Ulrich Ernst, ed. Susanne Gramatzki and Rüdiger Zymner (Köln: Böhlau, 2009), 19–35.
- Maximilian Georg Kellner, 'Die Lechfeldschlacht in der deutschen Geschichtsschreibung. Ein Ereignis zwischen historischer Forschung und populärwissenschaftlicher Darstellung', in *das Ungarnbild der Deutschen Historiographie*, ed. Márta Fata, Schriftenreihe des Instituts für Donauschwäbische Geschichte und Landeskunde 13 (Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 2004), 289–98.
- Samantha Kelly, *The New Solomon: Robert of Naples (1309-1343) and Fourteenth-Century Kingship*, The Medieval Mediterranean 48 (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2003).
- Matthew S. Kempshall, *Rhetoric and the Writing of History, 400-1500*, Historical Approaches (Manchester: MUP, 2011).
- Beverly Kennedy, *Knighthood in the Morte Darthur*, Arthurian Studies 11 (Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 1992).
- P. J. E. Kershaw, *Peaceful Kings: Peace, Power, and the Early Medieval Political Imagination* (Oxford: OUP, 2011).
- Norbert Kersken, *Geschichtsschreibung im Europa der 'nationes': Nationalgeschichte Gesamtdarstellungen im Mittelalter*, Münstersche Historische Forschungen 8 (Köln: Böhlau, 1995).
- Walther Kienast, 'Germanische Treue und "Königsheil"', *HZ* 227, no. 2 (1978): 265–324.
- Gábor Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses: Dynastic Cults in Medieval Central Europe*, trans. Eva Palmai (Cambridge: CUP, 2002).
- Holger A. Klein, 'Sacred Relics and Imperial Ceremonies at the Great Palace of Constantinople', in *Visualisierungen von Herrschaft: Frühmittelalterliche Residenzen: Gestalt und Zeremoniell: Internationales Kolloquium 3./4. Juni 2004 in Istanbul*, ed. Franz Alto Bauer, Byzas 5 (Istanbul: Ege Yayınları, 2006), 79–100.
- Harald Kleinschmidt, *Untersuchungen über das englische Königtum im 10. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen-Frankfurt am Main-Zürich: Musterschmidt, 1979).
- Hans-Walter Klewitz, 'Die Festkrönungen der Deutschen Könige', *ZSSR-KA* 28 (1939): 48–96.
- Hans-Walter Klewitz, 'Die heilige Lanze Heinrichs I.', *DAfEM* 6 (1943): 42–58.
- Ulrich Knefelkamp, *Das Mittelalter: Geschichte im Überblick* (Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 2002).
- Johannes Koder, 'Byzanz als Mythos und Erfahrung im Zeitalter Ottos I.', in *Ottonische Neuanfänge. Symposium zur Ausstellung 'Otto der Große, Magdeburg und Europa'*, ed. Bernd Schneidmüller and Stefan Weinfurter (Mainz: von Zabern, 2001), 237–50.
- Johannes Koder and Thomas Weber, *Liutprand von Cremona in Konstantinopel. Untersuchungen zum griechischen Sprachschatz und zu realienkundlichen Aussagen in seinen Werken*, Byzantina Vindobonensia 13 (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1980).
- Gerd Koenen, *Der Russland-Komplex: die Deutschen und der Osten, 1900-1945* (München: Beck, 2005).
- Hans-Georg Koll, *Die französischen Wörter "langue" und "langage" im Mittelalter*, Kölner Romanistische Arbeiten 10 (Genève-Paris: Droz, 1958).
- Rudolf Köpke, *Das Ende Der Kleinstaaterei. Ein Kapitel Aus Deutschlands Neuester Geschichte* (Berlin: Mittler & Sohn, 1866).
- Rudolf Köpke, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter der Herrschaft König Ottos I. 936-951* (Berlin: Duncker&Humblot, 1838).
- Ludger Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft und Gottes Gnade: zu Kontext und Funktion sakraler Vorstellungen in Historiographie und Bildzeugnissen der ottonisch-frühsalischen Zeit* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2001).

- Ludger Körntgen, 'Möglichkeiten und Grenzen Religiöser Herrschaftslegitimation. Zu den Dynastiewechseln 751 und 918/919', in *Der Frühmittelalterliche Staat – Europäische Perspektiven*, ed. Walter Pohl, Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 16 (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2009), 369–90.
- Ludger Körntgen, *Ottonen und Salier* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2002).
- Geoffrey Koziol, *Łaganie o przebaczenie i łaskę. Porządek rytualny i polityczny wczesnośredniowiecznej Francji*, trans. Zbigniew Dalewski (Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 2009).
- Harald Krahwinkel, *Friaul im Frühmittelalter: Geschichte einer Region vom Ende des fünften bis zum Ende des zehnten Jahrhunderts*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung 30 (Wien: Böhlau, 1992).
- Dennis M. Kratz, 'The Gesta Ottonis in Its Contexts', in *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: Rara Avis in Saxonia?: A Collection of Essays*, ed. Katharina M. Wilson, Medieval and Renaissance Monograph Series 7 (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Published for M.A.R.C., Medieval and Renaissance Collegium: Produced and distributed by MARC Pub. Co, 1987), 201–9.
- Riti Kroesen, 'One Hadingus—Two Haddingjar', *Scandinavian Studies* 59, no. 4 (1987): 404–35.
- Steven F. Kruger, *Dreaming in the Middle Ages*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 14 (Cambridge: CUP, 1992).
- Eric Kurlander, 'Hitler's Monsters: The Occult Roots of Nazism and the Emergence of the Nazi "Supernatural Imaginary"', *GH* 30, no. 4 (29 October 2012): 528–49.
- John Edward Kuykendall, 'The Unknown War: Popular War Fiction for Juveniles and the Anglo-German Conflict, 1939–1945' (unpublished Ph.D., University of South Carolina, 2002).
- Agnieszka Kuźmiuk-Ciekankowska, *Święty i historia: dynastia Przemysławidów i jej bohaterowie w dziele mnicha Krystiana* (Kraków: Avalon, 2007).
- Cristina La Rocca, 'Consorts Regni: A Problem of Gender? The Consortium between Amalasuntha and Theodahad in 534', in *Gender and Historiography: Studies in the Earlier Middle Ages in Honour of Pauline Stafford*, ed. Susan Reynolds, Susan M. Johns, and Janet L. Nelson (London: Institute of Historical Research, 2012), 127–43.
- Michael Lapidge, 'Byrhtferth and Oswald', in *St. Oswald of Worcester: Life and Influence*, ed. Nicholas Brooks and Catherine Cubitt, Studies in the Early History of Britain 2 (London-New York: Leicester University Press, 1996), 64–83.
- Michael Lapidge, 'The Hermeneutic Style in Tenth-Century Anglo-Latin Literature', *ASE* 4 (1975): 67–111.
- Bohdan Lapis, *Rex utilis: Kryteria oceny władców germańskich we wczesnym średniowieczu (od połowy V do początku VIII wieku)* (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 1986).
- Johannes Laudage, 'Hausrecht und Thronfolge. Überlegungen zur Königserhebung Ottos des Großen und zu den Aufständen Thankmars, Heinrichs und Liudolfs', *HJ* 112 (1992): 23–71.
- Johannes Laudage, *Otto der Grosse (912–973): eine Biographie* (Regensburg: F. Pustet, 2001).
- Jay Terry Lees, 'David Rex Fidelis? Otto the Great, the Gesta Ottonis, and the Primordia Coenobii Gandeshemensis', in *A Companion to Hrotsvit of Gandersheim (Fl. 960): Contextual and Interpretive Approaches*, ed. Phyllis Rugg Brown and Stephen L. Wailes, BCCT 34 (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2012), 201–34.
- Jay Terry Lees, 'Hrotsvit of Gandersheim and the Problem of Royal Succession in the East Frankish Kingdom', in *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: Contexts, Identities, Affinities, and Performances*, ed. Phyllis Rugg Brown, Katharina M. Wilson, and Linda A. McMillin (Toronto-Buffalo: UTP, 2004), 13–28.
- Régine Le Jan, 'Apprentissages militaires, rites de passage et remises d'armes au haut Moyen Âge', in *Education, apprentissages, initiation au Moyen Âge: Actes du premier colloque international de Montpellier, Université Paul Valéry, novembre 1991*, 1, Les cahiers du CRISIMA 1 (Montpellier: Université Paul-Valéry, 1993), 211–32.

- Régine Le Jan, 'Frankish Giving of Arms and Rituals of Power: Continuity and Change in the Carolingian Period', in *Rituals of Power: From Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Frans Theuvs and Janet L. Nelson (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2000), 281–309.
- Noël Lenski, 'Evoking the Pagan Past: *Instinctu Divinitatis* and Constantine's Capture of Rome', *Journal of Late Antiquity* 1, no. 2 (2008): 204–57.
- Claude Lévi-Strauss, 'The Structural Study of Myth', in *Structural Anthropology*, by Claude Lévi-Strauss, trans. Claire Jacobson and Brooke Grundfest Schoepf (New York: Basic Books, 1963), 206–31.
- Conrad Leyser, 'Episcopal Office in the Italy of Liudprand of Cremona, c.890–c.970', *EHR* CXXV, no. 515 (26 July 2010): 795–817.
- Karl Leyser, 'Early Medieval Warfare', in *Communications and Power in Medieval Europe: The Carolingian and Ottonian Centuries*, ed. Timothy Reuter (London-Rio Grande: Hambledon Press, 1994), 25–50.
- Karl Leyser, 'Ends and Means in Liudprand of Cremona', in *Communications and Power in Medieval Europe: The Carolingian and Ottonian Centuries*, ed. Timothy Reuter (London-Rio Grande: Hambledon Press, 1994), 125–42.
- Karl Leyser, 'Henry I and the Beginnings of the Saxon Empire', *EHR* 83, no. 326 (1968): 1–32.
- Karl Leyser, 'Liudprand of Cremona: Preacher and Homilist', in *Communications and Power in Medieval Europe: The Carolingian and Ottonian Centuries*, ed. Timothy Reuter (London-Rio Grande: Hambledon Press, 1994), 111–24.
- Karl Leyser, *Rule and Conflict in an Early Medieval Society Ottonian Saxony* (London: Arnold, 1979).
- Karl Leyser, 'The German Aristocracy from the Ninth to the Early Twelfth Century. A Historical and Cultural Sketch', *Past & Present*, no. 41 (1968): 25–53.
- Karl Leyser, 'The Ottonians and Wessex', in *Communications and Power in Medieval Europe: The Carolingian and Ottonian Centuries*, ed. Timothy Reuter (London-Rio Grande: Hambledon Press, 1994), 73–104.
- Karl Leyser, 'Warfare in the Western European Middle Ages: The Moral Debate', in *Communications and Power in Medieval Europe: The Gregorian Revolution and beyond*, ed. Timothy Reuter (London-Rio Grande: Hambledon Press, 1994), 189–203.
- Elisabeth Lienert, *Die <historische> Dietrichepik: Untersuchungen zu <Dietrichs Flucht>, <Rabenschlacht> und <Alpharts Tod>*, Texte und Studien zur mittelhochdeutschen Heldenepik 5 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010).
- Felice Lifshitz, 'Dudo of Saint Quentin: History of the Normans. Translated into English, with Introduction and Notes, by Eric Christiansen. (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1998. Pp. Xxxvii, 260. \$99.00.)', *The Historian* 62, no. 4 (June 2000): 913–14.
- Felice Lifshitz, 'Dudo's Historical Narrative and the Norman Succession of 996', *JMH* 20 (1994): 101–20.
- Martin Lintzel, 'Das abendländische Kaisertum im 9 und 10. Jahrhundert', in *Ausgewählte Schriften*, by Martin Lintzel, 2 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961), 122–41.
- Martin Lintzel, 'Die Kaiserpolitik Ottos des Großen', in *Ausgewählte Schriften*, by Martin Lintzel, 2 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961), 142–219.
- Martin Lintzel, 'Die Mathilden-Viten und das Wahrheitsproblem in der Überlieferung der Ottonenzeit', *AfK* 38 (1956): 152–66.
- Martin Lintzel, 'Die Schlacht von Riade und die Anfänge des Deutschen Staates', in *Ausgewählte Schriften*, by Martin Lintzel, 2 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961), 92–111.
- Martin Lintzel, 'Miscellen zur Geschichte des 10. Jahrhunderts', in *Ausgewählte Schriften*, by Martin Lintzel, 2 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961), 220–96.
- Martin Lintzel, 'Studien über Liudprand von Cremona', in *Ausgewählte Schriften*, by Martin Lintzel, 2 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961), 351–98.
- Vejas G. Liulevicius, *The German Myth of the East: 1800 to the Present* (Oxford: OUP, 2009).

- Friedgar Löbker, *Antike Topoi in der Deutschen Philhellenenliteratur: Untersuchungen zur Antikerezeption in der Zeit des Griechischen Unabhängigkeitskrieges (1821-1829)*, Südosteuropäische Arbeiten 106 (München: Oldenbourg, 2000).
- Laura Hibbard Loomis, 'The Holy Relics of Charlemagne and King Athelstan: The Lances of Longinus and St. Mauricius', *Speculum* 25, no. 4 (1 October 1950): 437–56.
- Chris Lorenz, 'Drawing the Line: "Scientific" History between Myth-Making and Myth-Breaking', in *Narrating the Nation: Representations in History, Media, and the Arts*, ed. Stefan Berger, Linas Eriksonas, and Andrew Mycock, Making Sense of History 11 (New York: Berghahn Books, 2008), 35–55.
- Ferdinand Lot, *Les derniers Carolingiens. Lothaire, Louis V, Charles de Lorraine (954-991)* (Paris: Émile Bouillon, 1891).
- Gerhard Lubich, *Verwandtsein: Lesarten einer politisch-sozialen Beziehung im Frühmittelalter: 6.-11. Jahrhundert*, Europäische Geschichtsdarstellungen 16 (Köln: Böhlau, 2008).
- Christian Lübke, 'Riade', in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, 5 (München-Zürich: Artemis Verlag; Lexma Verlag; J. B. Metzler, 1991), 801–2.
- Ernst Lucius, *Die Anfänge des Heiligenkults in der Christlichen Kirche*, ed. Gustav Anrich (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1904).
- Franz Lüdtkke, 'Das deutsche Ostland, seine Geschichte, Kultur, Bedeutung', in *Der Kampf um deutsches Ostland*, ed. Franz Lüdtkke and Ernst Otto Thiele (Düsseldorf: F. Floeder, n.d.), 5–35.
- Franz Lüdtkke, *Ein Jahrtausend Krieg zwischen Deutschland und Polen* (Stuttgart: Lutz, 1941).
- Franz Lüdtkke, *König Heinrich I.* (Berlin: Georg Stike, 1936).
- Franz Lüdtkke, *Um Weichsel und Warthe: Erinnerungen, Erzählungen, Gedichte* (Leipzig: Eichblatt-Verlag, 1940).
- Franz Lüdtkke and Hubert Müller-Schwanneke, eds., *Rufer des Ostens* (Posen: Hirt-Reger und v. Schroedel-Siemau, 1943).
- Franz Lüdtkke and Ernst Otto Thiele, eds., *Der Kampf um deutsches Ostland* (Düsseldorf: F. Floeder, n.d.).
- Rudolf Lüttich, *Ungarnzüge in Europa im 10. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Emil Ebering, 1910).
- Simon MacLean, *Kingship and Politics in the Late Ninth Century Charles the Fat and the End of the Carolingian Empire* (Cambridge: CUP, 2003).
- Otto Maenchen-Helfen, *The World of the Huns; Studies in Their History and Culture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973).
- Paul Magdalino, 'Observations on the Nea Ekklesia of Basil I', *JÖB* 37 (1987): 51–64.
- Paul Magdalino, 'The Other Image at the Palace Gate and the Visual Propaganda of Leo III', in *Byzantine Religious Culture Studies in Honor of Alice-Mary Talbot*, ed. Denis Sullivan, Elizabeth A. Fisher, and Stratis Papaioannou (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2012), 139–53.
- Gideon Maier, *Amtsträger und Herrscher in der Romania Gothica: vergleichende Untersuchungen zu den Institutionen der ostgermanischen Völkerwanderungsreiche* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2005).
- Piotr Majewski, 'Sage nie, du gehst den letzten Weg. Niemcy i Polacy po Powstaniu Listopadowym', in *Solidarność 1830: Niemcy i Polacy po Powstaniu Listopadowym = Polenbegeisterung: Deutsche und Polen nach dem Novemberraufstand 1830*, ed. Julia Franke (Warszawa: Zamek Królewski, 2005), 29–40.
- Jacek Makowski, *Manipulierte Sprache: Religiöser, Kultischer und Mystischer Wortschatz in der Sprache des Nationalsozialismus* (Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 2008).
- Werner Maleczek, 'Otto I. und Johannes XII. Überlegungen zur Kaiserkrönung von 962', in *Mediaevalia Augiensia*, ed. Jürgen Petersohn (Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2001), 151–203.
- John Marenbon, *Boethius, Great Medieval Thinkers* (Oxford: OUP, 2003).

- Alice Goldfarb Marquis, 'Words as Weapons: Propaganda in Britain and Germany during the First World War', *JCH* 13, no. 3 (1 July 1978): 467–98.
- Bernadette Martin-Hisard, 'L'empire byzantin dans l'œuvre de Lewond', in *L'Arménie et Byzance: Histoire et culture*, Byzantina Sorbonensia 12 (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1996), 135–44, <http://books.openedition.org/psorbonne/1808> (seen 30 November 2017).
- Helmut Maurer, *Der Herzog von Schwaben: Grundlagen, Wirkungen und Wesen seiner Herrschaft in ottonischer, salischer und staufischer Zeit* (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1978).
- Hans Eberhard Mayer, 'Ein Rundschreiben Rudolfs II. von Burgund Aus Dem Jahre 932', *DAfEM* 17 (1961): 507–17.
- Henry Mayr-Harting, 'Liudprand of Cremona's Account of His Legation to Constantinople (968) and Ottonian Imperial Strategy', *EHR* 116, no. 467 (2001): 539–56.
- Mark Mazower, *Hitlers Imperium: Europa unter der Herrschaft des Nationalsozialismus* (München: Beck, 2009).
- Michael McCormick, *Eternal Victory: Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium and the Early Medieval West* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1990).
- Michael McCormick, 'The Liturgy of War in the Early Middle Ages. Crisis, Litanies and the Carolingian Monarchy', *Viator* 15 (1984): 1–23.
- Rosamond McKitterick, 'Ottonian Intellectual Culture in the Tenth Century and the Role of Theophano', in *The Empress Theophano: Byzantium and the West at the Turn of the First Millennium*, ed. Adelbert Davids (Cambridge: CUP, 2002), 169–93.
- Rosamond McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the Written Word* (Cambridge: CUP, 1989).
- William H. McNeill, 'Mythistory, or Truth, Myth, History, and Historians', *The American Historical Review* 91, no. 1 (1 February 1986): 1–10.
- Bernard Mees, 'Hitler and Germanentum', *JCH* 39, no. 2 (1 April 2004): 255–70.
- Mathias Mehofer, Verena Leusch, and Birgit Bühler, 'Archäometallurgische Untersuchungen an der Heiligen Lanze in der Wiener Schatzkammer', in *Die Heilige Lanze in Wien: Insignie, Reliquie, 'Schicksalsspeer'*, ed. Franz Kirchweger (Wien-Milano: Kunsthistorisches Museum; Skira, 2005), 168–89.
- Eckhard Meineke, *Einführung in das Althochdeutsche* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2001).
- Sophia Mergiali-Sahas, 'Byzantine Emperors and Holy Relics. Use, and Misuse, of Sanctity and Authority', *JÖB* 51 (2001): 41–60.
- Edward Alfred Mierzwa, *Historia historiografii*, 3 (Historiografia niemieckojęzyczna) (Piotrków Trybunalski: Naukowe Wydawnictwo Piotrkowskie przy Filii Uniwersytetu Jana Kochanowskiego w Kielcach, 2015).
- Maureen C. Miller, 'Masculinity, Reform, and Clerical Culture: Narratives of Episcopal Holiness in the Gregorian Era', *Church History* 72, no. 1 (2003): 25–52.
- Leo Cunibert Mohlberg, *Mittelalterliche Handschriften*, Katalog der Handschriften der Zentralbibliothek Zürich 1 (Zürich: Zentralbibliothek Zürich, 1952).
- Walter Mohr, 'Audradus von Sens, Prophet und Kirchenpolitiker', *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 29 (1959): 239–67.
- Wilhelm Mommsen, *Stein, Ranke, Bismarck: ein Beitrag zur politischen und sozialen Bewegung des 19. Jahrhunderts* (München: Bruckmann, 1954).
- Peter Moraw and Rudolf Schieffer, eds., *Die deutschsprachige Mediävistik im 20. Jahrhundert*, Vorträge und Forschungen 62 (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2005).
- George L. Mosse, *Die Nationalisierung der Massen: politische Symbolik und Massenbewegungen von den Befreiungskriegen bis zum Dritten Reich* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus-Verl., 1993).
- Eckhard Müller-Mertens, 'König, Volk und Reich im frühen und hohen Mittelalter', in *Geschichte des Mittelalters für unsere Zeit: Erträge des Kongresses des Verbandes der Geschichtslehrer*

- Deutschlands 'Geschichte des Mittelalters im Geschichtsunterricht', Quedlinburg 20.-23. Oktober 1999*, ed. Rolf Ballof (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2003), 204–16.
- Eckhard Müller-Mertens, 'The Ottonians as Kings and Emperors', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, ed. Rosamond McKitterick and Timothy Reuter, 3, c.900–1024 (Cambridge: CUP, 1995), 233–66.
- Herfried Münkler, *Die Deutschen und ihre Mythen*, (Berlin: Rowohlt Berlin, 2009).
- Peter Munz, 'History and Myth', *The Philosophical Quarterly* 6, no. 22 (1 January 1956): 1–16.
- Brian Murdoch, *The Germanic Hero: Politics and Pragmatism in Early Medieval Poetry* (London-Rio Grande: Hambledon Press, 1996).
- Alexander Callander Murray, 'Post vocantur Merovingii: Fredegar, Merovech, and "sacral kingship"', in *After Rome's Fall: Narrators and Sources of Early Medieval History: Essays Presented to Walter Goffart*, ed. Alexander C. Murray (Toronto-Buffalo: UTP, 1998), 121–52.
- Jörg Muth, *Command Culture: Officer Education in the U.S. Army and the German Armed Forces, 1901-1940, and the Consequences for World War II* (Denton: University of North Texas Press, 2011).
- Klaus Nass, *Die Reichschronik des Annalista Saxo und die sächsische Geschichtsschreibung im 12. Jahrhundert*, MGH Schriften 41 (Hannover: Hahn, 1996).
- Helmut Naumann, 'Rätsel des letzten Aufstandes gegen Otto I. (953-954)', *AfK* 46 (1964): 133–84.
- Janet L. Nelson, 'Hincmar of Rheims on King-making: The Evidence of the Annals of St. Bertin, 861-882', in *Rulers and Ruling Families in Early Medieval Europe: Alfred, Charles the Bald, and Others*, by Janet L. Nelson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), XVII:16–34.
- Janet L. Nelson, 'Inauguration Rituals', in *Politics and Ritual in Early Medieval Europe*, by Janet L. Nelson (London-Ronceverte: Hambledon Press, 1986), 283–307.
- Janet L. Nelson, 'National Synods, Kingship as Office, and Royal Anointing: An Early Medieval Syndrome', in *Politics and Ritual in Early Medieval Europe*, by Janet L. Nelson (London-Ronceverte: Hambledon Press, 1986), 239–57.
- Janet L. Nelson, 'Ritual and Reality in the Early Medieval Ordines', in *Politics and Ritual in Early Medieval Europe*, by Janet L. Nelson (London-Ronceverte: Hambledon Press, 1986), 329–39.
- Janet L. Nelson, 'Symbols in Context: Rulers' Inauguration Rituals in Byzantium and the West in the Early Middle Ages', in *Politics and Ritual in Early Medieval Europe*, by Janet L. Nelson (London-Ronceverte: Hambledon Press, 1986), 259–81.
- Janet L. Nelson, 'The Earliest Royal Ordo: Some Liturgical and Historical Aspects', in *Politics and Ritual in Early Medieval Europe*, by Janet L. Nelson (London-Ronceverte: Hambledon Press, 1986), 341–60.
- Janet L. Nelson, *The Frankish World, 750-900* (London-Rio Grande: Hambledon Press, 1996).
- Janet L. Nelson, 'The Search for Peace in a Time of War: the Carolingian Brüderkrieg, 840-843', in *Träger und Instrumentarien des Friedens im Hohen und Späten Mittelalter*, ed. Johannes Fried, *VuF* 43 (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1996), 87–114.
- Janet L. Nelson, 'The Second English Ordo', in *Politics and Ritual in Early Medieval Europe*, by Janet L. Nelson (London-Ronceverte: Hambledon Press, 1986), 361–73.
- Janet L. Nelson, 'Violence in the Carolingian World and the Ritualization of Ninth-Century Warfare', in *Violence and Society in the Early Medieval West*, ed. Guy Halsall (Rochester: Boydell Press, 1998), 90–107.
- Janet L. Nelson, 'Warum es so viele Versionen von der Kaiserkrönung Karls des Großen gibt: um 801', in *Die Macht des Königs: Herrschaft in Europa vom Frühmittelalter bis in die Neuzeit*, ed. Bernhard Jussen (München: Beck, 2005), 38–54.
- Otto Neudeck, *Erzählen von Kaiser Otto: Zur Fiktionalisierung von Geschichte in Mittelhochdeutscher Literatur*, Norm und Struktur 18 (Köln: Böhlau, 2003).

- Francis Xavier Newman, 'Somnium: Medieval Theories of Dreaming and the Form of Vision Poetry' (unpublished Ph.D., Princeton University, 1963).
- Lubor Niederle, *Slovanské starožitnosti: Oddíl kulturní, Dílu II. svazek 1. (Oddíl VI.: Víra a náboženství)* (Praha: Bursík a Kohout, 1916).
- Galit Noga-Banai, 'The Sarcophagus of Louis the Pious at Metz. A Roman Memory Reused', *FMS* 45 (2011): 37–50.
- Christoph Obermüller, *Die deutschen Stämme. Stammesgeschichte als Namensgeschichte und Reichsgeschichte* (Bielefeld-Leipzig: Velhagen&Klasing, 1941).
- Jörg Oberste, 'Heilige und ihre Reliquien in der Politischen Kultur der früheren Ottonenzeit', *FMS* 37 (2008): 73–98.
- Veronica Ortenbeg, 'The King from Overseas: Why Did Aethelstan Matter in Tenth-Century Continental Affairs?', in *England and the Continent in the Tenth Century: Studies in Honour of Wilhelm Levison (1876-1947)*, ed. David W. Rollason, Conrad Leyser, and Hannah Williams, *Studies in the Early Middle Ages* 37 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010).
- Joanna Overing, 'Role of Myth: An Anthropological Perspective, or: "The Reality of the Really Made-Up"', in *Myths and Nationhood*, ed. George Schöpfung and Geoffrey Hosking (London: Hurst in association with the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London, 1997), 1–18.
- Marcin Rafał Pauk, 'Moneta w kulturze politycznej średniowiecza: wokół ikonografii denarów czeskich z pierwszej połowy XII stulecia', *KH* 119, no. 3 (2012): 467–506.
- Edward Peters, 'Rex Inutilis: Aspects of Royal Inadequacy in Medieval Law and Literature; 751-1400' (unpublished Ph.D., Yale University, 1967).
- Jürgen Petersohn, 'Über monarchische Insignien und ihre Funktion im mittelalterlichen Reich', *HZ* 266, no. 1 (1 February 1998): 47–96.
- Daniele Piazzi, *Dal sacramentario al messale: frammenti liturgici cremonesi tra XII e XIII secolo* (Cremona: Nuova editrice cremonese, 2006).
- Aneta Pieniądz, 'Wokół „Antapodosis” Liutpranda z Cremony', in *Cor hominis: wielkie namiętności w dziejach, źródłach i studiach nad przeszłością*, ed. Stanisław Rosik and Przemysław Wiszeński (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2007), 29–35.
- William Pietz, 'The "Post-Colonialism" of Cold War Discourse', *Social Text*, no. 19/20 (1 October 1988): 55–75.
- Martin Pilch, *Der Rahmen der Rechtsgewohnheiten: Kritik des Normensystemdenkens entwickelt am Rechtsbegriff der mittelalterlichen Rechtsgeschichte* (Wien: Böhlau, 2009).
- Alheydis Plassmann, *Origo gentis: Identitäts- und Legitimitätsstiftung in früh- und hochmittelalterlichen Herkunftserzählungen* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2006).
- Andrzej Pleszczyński, *The Birth of a Stereotype: Polish Rulers and Their Country in German Writings, c. 1000 A.D.*, trans. Robert Bubczyk, *East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 450-1450* 15 (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2011).
- Walter Pohl, 'Memory, Identity and Power in Lombard Italy', in *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Yitzhak Hen and Matthew Innes (Cambridge: CUP, 2000), 9–28.
- Walter Pohl, 'Telling the Difference: Signs of Ethnic Identity', in *Strategies of Distinction: The Construction of Ethnic Communities, 300-800*, ed. Walter Pohl and Helmut Reimitz, *TRW* 2 (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 1998), 17–69.
- Günter Prinzing, 'Epiros 1204–1261: Historical Outline – Sources – Prosopography', in *Identities and Allegiances in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, ed. Judith Herrin and Guillaume Saint-Guillain (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 81–98.

- Günter Prinzing, 'Spuren Einer Religiösen Bruderschaft in Epiros Um 1225? Zur Deutung der Memorialtexte im Codex Cromwell 11', *BZ* 101, no. 2 (January 2009): 751–72.
- Jaan Puhvel, *Comparative Mythology* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987).
- Uwe Puschner, 'Die Germanenideologie im Kontext der völkischen Weltanschauung', *Göttinger Forum Für Altertumswissenschaft* 4 (2001): 85–97.
- Uwe Puschner, 'Germanenideologie und Völkische Weltanschauung', in *Zur Geschichte Der Gleichung 'germanisch – Deutsch'*, ed. Heinrich Beck et al., *Reallexikon Der Germanischen Altertumskunde – Ergänzungsbände* 34 (Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2004), 103–29.
- Jerzy Pysiak, *Król i Korona Cierniowa: kult relikwii we Francji Kapetyngów* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 2012).
- Pierre Racine, 'Hermann Heimpel à Strasbourg', in *Deutsche Historiker im Nationalsozialismus*, ed. Winfried Schulze and Otto Gerhard Oexle, Originalausg, die Zeit des Nationalsozialismus (Frankfurt: Fischer Taschenbuch, 1999), 142–56.
- Werner Radig, *Heinrich I. der Burgenbauer und Reichsgründer* (Leipzig: C. Rabitzsch, 1937).
- Leopold von Ranke, 'Vorrede', in *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter König Heinrich I*, by Georg Waitz, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter Dem Sächsischen Hause 1* (Berlin: Duncker&Humblot, 1837), V–XII.
- Leopold von Ranke, *Weltgeschichte*, 6.2 (Leipzig: Duncker&Humblot, 1885).
- Claudia Rapp, 'Imperial Ideology in the Making: Eusebius of Caesarea on Constantine as "bishop"', *The Journal of Theological Studies* 49, no. 2 (1 October 1998): 685–95.
- Claudia Rapp, 'Old Testament Models for Emperors in Early Byzantium', in *The Old Testament in Byzantium*, ed. Paul Magdalino and Robert S. Nelson, *Dumbarton Oaks Byzantine Symposia and Colloquia* (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2010), 175–97.
- Matthew M. Reeve, 'The Painted Chamber at Westminster, Edward I, and the Crusade', *Viator* 37 (2006): 189–221.
- M. D. Reeve, 'The Manuscript Tradition of Cornelius Nepos by P. K. Marshall', *The Classical Review* 29, no. 1 (1 January 1979): 53–55.
- Patrick V. Reid, *Moses's Staff and Aeneas's Shield: The Way of the Torah versus Classical Heroism* (Lanham: University Press of America, 2005).
- David J. Reimer, 'The "Foe" and the "North" in Jeremiah', *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 101, no. 2 (1989): 223–32.
- Kurt Reindel, 'Herzog Arnulf und das Regnum Bavariae', *ZBL* 17 (1954/1953): 187–252.
- Jan Erik Rekdal, 'From Wine in a Goblet to Milk in Cowdung. The Transformation of Early Christian Kings in Three Post-Viking Tales from Ireland', in *Ideology and Power in the Viking and Middle Ages: Scandinavia, Iceland, Ireland, Orkney, and the Faeroes*, ed. Gro Steinsland, *The Northern World* 52 (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2011), 211–68.
- Amy G. Remensnyder, 'Legendary Treasure at Conques: Reliquaries and Imaginative Memory', *Speculum* 71, no. 4 (1 October 1996): 884–906.
- Amy G. Remensnyder, *Remembering Kings Past: Monastic Foundation Legends in Medieval Southern France* (Ithaca: CorUP, 1995).
- Michael Rentschler, 'Griechische Kultur und Byzanz im Urteil Westlicher Autoren des 10. Jahrhunderts', *Saeculum* 29, no. 4 (n.d.): 324–55.
- Michael Rentschler, *Liudprand von Cremona: Eine Studie zum Ost-Westlichen Kulturgefälle im Mittelalter*, *Frankfurter Wissenschaftliche Beiträge* 14 (Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1981).
- Timothy Reuter, "'Episcopi Cum Sua Militia': The Prelate as Warrior in the Early Staufer Era", in *Warriors and Churchmen in the High Middle Ages Essays Presented to Karl Leyser*, ed. Timothy Reuter (London-Rio Grande: Hambledon Press, 1992), 79–94.

- Timothy Reuter, "Fili matris nostrae pugnant adversum nos": bonds and tensions between prelates and their "milites" in the German high Middle Ages', in *Chiesa e Mondo feudale nei secoli X-XII: Atti della Dodicesima Settimana Internazionale di Studio, Mendola, 24-28 Agosto 1992*, Scienze Storiche 59 (Milano: Vita e pensiero, 1995), 241–76.
- Timothy Reuter, *Germany in the Early Middle Ages, C. 800-1056* (London-New York: Longman, 1991).
- Timothy Reuter, "Regemque, quem in Francia pene perdidit, in patria magnifice recepit." Ottonian Ruler Representation in Synchronic and Diachronic Comparison', in *Herrschaftsrepräsentation im Ottonischen Sachsen*, ed. Gerd Althoff and Ernst Schubert (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1998), 363–80.
- Timothy Reuter, "The 'Imperial Church System' of the Ottonian and Salian Rulers: A Reconsideration", *JEH* 33, no. 3 (1982): 347–74.
- Timothy Reuter, 'The Medieval German Sonderweg? The Empire and Its Rulers in the High Middle Ages', in *Medieval Politics and Modern Mentalities*, ed. Janet L. Nelson (Cambridge: CUP, 2006), 388–412.
- Timothy Reuter, 'The Ottonians and Carolingian Tradition', in *Medieval Politics and Modern Mentalities*, ed. Timothy Reuter and Janet L. Nelson (Cambridge: CUP, 2006), 268–83.
- Karl Heinrich Rexroth, 'Volksprache und werdendes Volksbewußtsein im ostfränkischen Reich', in *Aspekte der Nationenbildung im Mittelalter: Ergebnisse d. Marburger Rundgespräche 1972-1975*, ed. Helmut Beumann and Werner Schröder, Nationes 1 (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1978), 275–315.
- Luigi Giovanni Giuseppe Ricci, *Problemi sintattici nelle opere di Liutprando da Cremona* (Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo, 1996).
- Pierre Riché, *The Carolingians: A Family Who Forged Europe*, trans. Michael Idomir Allen, Middle Ages Series (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993).
- Peter Rickard, *The Embarrassments of Irregularity: The French Language in the Eighteenth Century* (London: CUP, 1981).
- Manuel Riu Riu, 'Consideraciones en torno del Cronicon Luitprandi', in *Sardegna, Mediterraneo e Atlantico tra medioevo ed età moderna: studi storici in memoria di Alberto Boscolo*, ed. Luisa D'Arienzo, 2 (Roma: Bulzoni, 1993), 23–29.
- Levi Roach, 'Anastasia Brakhman, Außenseiter und „Insider“. Kommunikation und Historiographie im Umfeld des ottonischen Herrscherhofes', *MIÖG* 125, no. 2 (2017): 439–41.
- Levi Roach, 'Submission and Homage: Feudo-Vassalic Bonds and the Settlement of Disputes in Ottonian Germany', *History* 97, no. 327 (July 2012): 355–79.
- Steven Robbie, 'Can Silence Speak Volumes? Widukind's Res Gestae Saxonicae and the Coronation of Otto I Reconsidered', *EME* 20, no. 3 (August 2012): 333–62.
- Fernando Rodríguez Mediano and Mercedes García-Arenal, 'Jerónimo Román de La Higuera and the Lead Books of Sacromonte', in *The Conversos and Moriscos in Late Medieval Spain and beyond*, ed. Kevin Ingram, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions 141, 160 (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2009), 243–68.
- Robert Allen Rouse, *The Idea of Anglo-Saxon England in Middle English Romance*, Studies in Medieval Romance (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2005).
- Jay Rubenstein, 'William of Poitiers Talks about War', in *The Middle Ages in Texts and Texture: Reflections on Medieval Sources*, ed. Jason Glenn (Toronto: UTP, 2011), 129–40.
- Steven Runciman, *The Emperor Romanus Lecapenus and His Reign: A Study of Tenth-Century Byzantium*, Cambridge Paperback Library (Cambridge: CUP, 1988).
- Ingo Runde, *Xanten im frühen und hohen Mittelalter: Sagentradition – Stiftsgeschichte – Stadtwerdung* (Köln: Böhlau, 2003).
- Frederick H. Russell, *The Just War in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: CUP, 1977).

- Patrick Salmon, *Scandinavia and the Great Powers 1890-1940* (Cambridge: CUP, 2002).
- Roedes Salvador-Bello, 'Edgar Panegyrics in the "Anglo-Saxon Chronicle"', in *Edgar, King of the English, 959-975: New Interpretations*, ed. Donald G. Scragg, Publications of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies 8 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2008), 252-72.
- Giovanna Salvucci, '"The King Is Dead": the Thanatology of Kings in the Old Norse Synoptic Histories of Norway, 1035-1161.' (unpublished Ph.D., University of Durham, 2005).
- Corinne J. Saunders, *Rape and Ravishment in the Literature of Medieval England* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2001).
- George Osborne Sayles, *Scripta diversa* (London: Hambledon Press, 1982).
- Martin Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur: bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian*, 1 (München: Beck, 1970).
- Theodor Schieffer, 'MOHR W., König Heinrich I. Eine Kritische Studie zur Geschichtsschreibung der Letzten Hundert Jahre. Saarlouis, N. Fontaine, 1950. 87 S., HJ 73 (1954): 260-62.
- Hans Schleier, 'Geschichtstheorie und Geschichtsschreibung bei Leopold von Ranke', in *Leopold von Ranke und die Moderne Geschichtswissenschaft*, ed. Wolfgang J. Mommsen, (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1988), 115-30.
- Walter Schlesinger, 'Die Entstehung der Nationen. Gedanken zu einem Forschungsprogramm', in *Aspekte der Nationenbildung im Mittelalter: Ergebnisse d. Marburger Rundgespräche 1972-1975*, ed. Helmut Beumann and Werner Schröder, Nationes 1 (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1978), 11-62.
- Walter Schlesinger, 'Die Königserhebung Heinrichs I. zu Fritzlar im Jahre 919', in *Ausgewählte Aufsätze von Walter Schlesinger, 1965-1979*, ed. Walter Schlesinger and Hans Patze (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1987), 199-220.
- Walter Schlesinger, 'Herrschaft und Gefolgschaft in der Germanisch-Deutschen Verfassungsgeschichte', *HZ* 176 (1953): 225-75.
- Karl Schmid, 'Die Thronfolge Ottos des Großen', in *Königswahl und Thronfolge in ottonisch-frühdeutscher Zeit*, ed. Eduard Hlawitschka (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971), 417-508.
- Karl Schmid, 'Neue Quellen zum Verständnis des Adels im 10. Jahrhundert', *ZGO* 108 (NF 69) (1960): 185-232.
- Hans-Werner Schmidt, *Die Förderung des vaterländischen Geschichtsbildes durch die Verbindung für historische Kunst, 1854-1933* (Marburg: Jonas, 1985).
- Theun-Mathias Schmidt, 'X.42 Fragmente Eines Sarkophags Mit Dem Durchzug der Israeliten Durch das Rote Meer', in 799, *Kunst und Kultur der Karolingerzeit: Karl der Grosse und Papst Leo III. in Paderborn: Katalog der Ausstellung, Paderborn 1999*, ed. Christoph Stiegemann and Matthias Wemhoff (Mainz: P. von Zabern, 1999), 763-66.
- Ruth Schmidt-Wiegand, 'Wahl und Weihe des deutschen Königs nach den Bilderhandschriften des Sachsenspiegels', in *Studien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters: Jürgen Petersohn zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Matthias Thumser, Annegret Wenz-Haubfleisch, and Peter Wiegand (Stuttgart: Theiss, 2000), 222-38.
- Cornelia Schmitz-Berning, *Vokabular des Nationalsozialismus* (Berlin: New York: de Gruyter, 2007).
- Friedrich Schneider, *Die neueren Anschauungen der deutschen Historiker über die deutsche Kaiserpolitik des Mittelalters und die mit ihr verbundene Ostpolitik* (Weimar: H. Böhlau, 1943).
- Reinhard Schneider, *Königswahl und Königserhebung im Frühmittelalter: Untersuchungen Z. Herrschaftsnachfolge Bei D. Langobarden U. Merowingern*, MGM 3 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1972).
- Bernd Schneidmüller, 'Reich, Volk, Nation: die Entstehung des Deutschen Reiches und der Deutschen Nation im Mittelalter', in *Mittelalterliche Nationen, Neuzeitliche Nationen: Probleme der Nationenbildung in Europa*, ed. Almut Bues and Rex Rexheuser, Quellen und Studien / Deutsches Historisches Institut Warschau 2 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995), 73-102.
- Edward J. Schoenfeld, 'Anglo-Saxon "Burhs" and Continental "Bürgen": Early Medieval Fortifications in Constitutional Perspective', *HSJ* 6 (1994): 49-66.

- Edward J. Schoenfeld, 'Freedom and Military Reform in Tenth-Century Saxony', in *The Circle of War in the Middle Ages Essays on Medieval Military and Naval History*, ed. Donald J. Kagay and L.J. Andrew Villalon (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1999), 59–72.
- George Schöpfli, 'Functions of Myth and a Taxonomy of Myths', in *Myths and Nationhood*, ed. George Schöpfli and Geoffrey Hosking (London: Hurst in association with the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London, 1997), 19–35.
- Percy Ernst Schramm, 'Baugen-armillae: zur Geschichte der königlichen Armspangen', in *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik: Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte vom dritten bis zum sechzehnten Jahrhundert*, ed. Percy Ernst Schramm, MGH Schriften 13 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1954), 538–53.
- Percy Ernst Schramm, 'Der Ablauf der Deutschen Königsweihe Nach dem "Mainzer Ordo" (um 960)', in *Kaiser, Könige und Päpste. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*, by Percy Ernst Schramm, 3 (Vom 10. bis zum 13. Jahrhundert) (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1969), 59–107.
- Percy Ernst Schramm, 'Die "Heilige Lanze", Reliquie und Herrschaftszeichen des Reiches und ihre Replik in Krakau. Ein Überblick über die Geschichte der Königs Lanze', in *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik: Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte vom dritten bis zum sechzehnten Jahrhundert*, ed. Percy Ernst Schramm, MGH Schriften 13 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1954), 492–537.
- Percy Ernst Schramm, 'Ottos I. Königskrönung in Aachen (936). die Vorakte und die Einzelvorgänge im Rahmen der Deutschen Geschichte', in *Kaiser, Könige und Päpste. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*, by Percy Ernst Schramm, 3 (Vom 10. bis zum 13. Jahrhundert) (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1969), 33–58.
- Percy Ernst Schramm, 'Salbung und Krönung Bei Den Ostfranken bis zur Thronbesteigung König Heinrichs I', in *Kaiser, Könige und Päpste. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*, by Percy Ernst Schramm, 2 (Vom Tode Karls des Großen (814) bis zum Anfang des 10. Jahrhunderts) (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1968), 287–305.
- Percy Ernst Schramm, 'Wahl, Krönung und Staatssymbolik in Den Burgundischen Königreichen (Seit 879 Bzw. 888)', in *Kaiser, Könige und Päpste. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*, by Percy Ernst Schramm, 2 (Vom Tode Karls des Großen (814) bis zum Anfang des 10. Jahrhunderts) (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1968), 249–86.
- Klaus Schreiner, 'Signa victicia: Heilige Zeichen in kriegerischen Konflikten des Mittelalters', in *Rituale, Zeichen, Bilder: Formen und Funktionen symbolischer Kommunikation im Mittelalter. Festschrift für Klaus Schreiner zum 80. Geburtstag*, by Klaus Schreiner (Köln: Böhlau, 2011), 11–63.
- Peter Schreiner, 'Zur griechischen Schrift im hochmittelalterlichen Westen. Der Kreis um Liudprand von Cremona', *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 45 (2003): 305–17.
- Kerstin Schulmeyer-Ahl, *Der Anfang vom Ende der Ottonen* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008).
- Walther Schultze, 'Die sächsischen und salischen Kaiser (911–1125)', in *Gebhardts Handbuch der Deutschen Geschichte*, ed. Ferdinand Hirsch, 1 (Von der Urzeit bis zur Reformation) (Stuttgart- Berlin–Leipzig: Union Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1913), 256–360.
- Mechthild Schulze-Dörlamm, 'Die Heilige Lanze in Wien. Die Frühgeschichte des karolingisch-ottonischen Herrschaftszeichens aus archäologischer Sicht', *Jahrbuch des Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum* 58 (2011): 707–42.
- Constanze M. F. Schummer, 'Liudprand of Cremona – a Diplomat?', in *Byzantine Diplomacy: Papers from the Twenty-Fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990*, ed. Jonathan Shepard and Simon Franklin, Publications / Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies 1 (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1992), 197–201.
- Bernd Schütte, *Untersuchungen zu den Lebensbeschreibungen der Königin Mathilde*, MGH Studien 9 (Hannover: Hahn, 1994).
- Herbert Schutz, *The Carolingians in Central Europe, their History, Arts, and Architecture: A Cultural History of Central Europe, 750-900*, Cultures, Beliefs, and Traditions 18 (Brill-Boston: Brill, 2004).
- Bernd Schwenk, 'Das Hundetragen. Ein Rechtsbrauch im Mittelalter', *HJ* 110 (1990): 289–308.
- Berent Schwineköper, 'Christus-Reliquien-Verehrung und Politik', *BfDL* 117 (1981): 183–281.

- Westrem D. Scott, 'Against Gog and Magog', in *Text and Territory: Geographical Imagination in the European Middle Ages*, ed. Sylvia Tomasch and Sealy Gilles, The Middle Ages Series (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998), 54–75.
- Giuseppe Sergi, 'The Kingdom of Italy', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, ed. Timothy Reuter, 3, c.900–1024 (Cambridge: CUP, 1995), 346–71.
- Thomas Serrier, "Barbaren aus dem Osten" und "barbarischer Osten" – Ein Vergleich deutsch-französischer und deutsch-polnischer Stereotypie im 19. Jahrhundert', *Tel Aviver Jahrbuch für Deutsche Geschichte* 40 (2012): 60–77.
- Irfan Shahîd, *Byzantium and the Arabs in the Sixth Century* (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1995).
- Frank Shaw, 'Marozia, die Totgeschwiegene. Zu den gesäuberten Papstgeschichten der mittelhochdeutschen Chronistik', in *Mittelhochdeutsch: Beiträge zur Überlieferung, Sprache und Literatur: Festschrift für Kurt Gärtner zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. Ralf Plate and Martin Schubert (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 273–80.
- Jonathan Shepard, 'Courts in East and West', in *The Medieval World*, ed. Janet L. Nelson and Peter Linehan (London-New York: Routledge, 2001), 14–36.
- Gabriel Silagi, 'Die Ungarnstürme in der ungarischen Geschichtsschreibung: Anonymus und Simon von Kéza', in *Popoli Delle Stepe: Unni, Avari, Ungari*, Settimane 35 (Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1988), 245–72.
- Patricia Silber, 'Hrotsvit and the Devil', in *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: Contexts, Identities, Affinities, and Performances*, ed. Phyllis Rugg Brown, Katharina M. Wilson, and Linda A. McMillin (Toronto: UTP, 2004), 177–92.
- Vito Sivo, 'Studi recenti su Liutprando di Cremona', *Quaderni Medievali* 44 (1997): 214–25.
- Andrew M. Small, 'Constantinopolitan Connections: Liudprand of Cremona and Byzantium', in *From Constantinople to the Frontier: The City and the Cities*, ed. Theofili Kampianaki, Nicholas S.M. Matheou, and Lorenzo M. Bondioli (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2016), 84–97.
- Jay M. Smith, *The Culture of Merit: Nobility, Royal Service, and the Making of Absolute Monarchy in France, 1600–1789*, Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Civilization (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996).
- Katherine Allen Smith, *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture*, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion 37 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2011).
- Scott Thompson Smith, 'The Edgar Poems and the Poetics of Failure in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle', *ASE* 39 (2011): 105–37.
- Dion C. Smythe, 'Insiders and Outsiders', in *A Companion to Byzantium*, ed. Liz James (Chichester-Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 67–80.
- W. Söldan, 'Wo find Eberhard von Franken und Giselbert von Lothringen gefallen?', *Archiv für Hessische Geschichte und Altertumskunde* 5 (1846): 1–9.
- Bernd Sösemann, 'Die sog. Hunnenrede Wilhelms II. Textkritische und interpretatorische Bemerkungen zur Ansprache des Kaisers vom 27. Juli 1900 in Bremerhaven', *HZ* 222, no. 2 (1976): 342–58.
- Gabrielle M. Spiegel, 'The Reditus Regni ad Stirpem Karoli Magni: A New Look', *French Historical Studies* 7, no. 2 (1971): 145–74.
- Paul Srodecki, *Antemurale Christianitatis: Zur Genese der Bollwerksrhetorik im östlichen Mitteleuropa an der Schwelle vom Mittelalter zur Frühen Neuzeit*, HS 508 (Husum: Matthiesen, 2015).
- Pauline Stafford, 'Succession and Inheritance: A Gendered Perspective on Alfred's Family History', in *Alfred the Great: Papers from the Eleventh-Centenary Conferences*, by Timothy Reuter (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 251–64.
- Pauline Stafford, 'The Reign of Æthelred II, a Study in the Limitations on Royal Policy and Action', in *Æthelred the Unready: Papers from the Millenary Conference*, ed. David Hill, BAR British Series 59 (Oxford: British Archaeological Reports, 1978), 15–46.

- Nikolaus Staubach, 'Graecae Gloriam: die Rezeption des Griechischen als Element spätkarolingisch-frühottonischer Hofkultur', in *Kaiserin Theophanu. Begegnung des Ostens und Westens um die Wende des Ersten Jahrtausends. Gedenkschrift des Kölner Schnütgen-Museums zum 1000. Todesjahr der Kaiserin*, ed. Anton von Euw and Peter Schreiner, 1 (Köln: Schnütgen Museum, 1991), 343–68.
- Nikolaus Staubach, 'Historia oder Satira? Zur literarischen Stellung der Antapodosis Liudprands von Cremona', *Mittelateinisches Jahrbuch* 24/25 (90 1989): 461–87.
- Nikolaus Staubach, *Rex christianus: Hofkultur und Herrschaftspropaganda im Reich Karls des Kahlen*, *Pictura et Poesis* 2 (Köln: Böhlau, 1993).
- Jane Stevenson, 'Hrotsvit in Context: Convents and Culture in Ottonian Germany', in *A Companion to Hrotsvit of Gandersheim (Fl. 960): Contextual and Interpretive Approaches*, ed. Phyllis Rugg Brown and Stephen L. Wailes, BCCT 34 (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2012), 35–62.
- Jane Stevenson, *Women Latin Poets: Language, Gender, and Authority, from Antiquity to the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: OUP, 2005).
- Rachel Stone, *Morality and Masculinity in the Carolingian Empire*, CSMLT Fourth Series 81 (Cambridge: CUP, 2012).
- Joanna Story, *Carolingian Connections: Anglo-Saxon England and Carolingian Francia, c. 750–870* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003).
- Ioannis Stouraitis, '“Just War” and “Holy War” in the Middle Ages. Rethinking Theory through the Byzantine Case-Study', *JÖB* 62 (2012): 227–64.
- Grzegorz Strauchold, 'Der Westgedanke in der polnischen Geschichtswissenschaft nach 1945', in *Deutsche Ostforschung und Polnische Westforschung im Spannungsfeld von Wissenschaft und Politik: Disziplinen im Vergleich*, ed. Jan M. Piskorski, Jörg Hackmann, and Rudolf Jaworski, *Deutsche Ostforschung und Polnische Westforschung* 1 (Osnabrück-Poznań: Fibre; Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk, 2002), 47–80.
- Ivan Strenski, *Four Theories of Myth in Twentieth-Century History: Cassirer, Eliade, Lévi-Strauss, and Malinowski* (Iowa: University of Iowa Press, 1987).
- Matthew Strickland, *War and Chivalry: The Conduct and Perception of War in England and Normandy, 1066–1217*, (New York: CUP, 1996).
- Jerzy Strzelczyk, *Otton III* (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 2000).
- Benedikt Stuchey, 'German Historical Writing', in *The Oxford History of Historical Writing*, ed. Stuart Macintyre, Juan Maignascha, and Attila Pók, 4: 1800–1945 (Oxford-New York: OUP, 2011), 161–83.
- Wolfgang Stürner, 'Friedrich II.: Antichrist und Friedenskaiser', in *Mythen Europas: Schlüsselfiguren der Imagination*, ed. Michael Neumann and Inge B. Milfull, 3: Zwischen Mittelalter und Neuzeit (Darmstadt: F. Pustet, 2005), 15–29.
- Jon N. Sutherland, *Liudprand of Cremona, Bishop, Diplomat, Historian: Studies of the Man and His Age*, *Biblioteca degli 'Studi Medievali'* 14 (Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1988).
- Jon N. Sutherland, 'The Mission to Constantinople in 968 and Liudprand of Cremona', *Traditio* 31 (1975): 54–81.
- Heinrich von Sybel, 'Über die Neueren Darstellungen der deutschen Kaiserzeit', in *Universalstaat oder Nationalstaat. Macht und Ende des Ersten deutschen Reiches. die Streitschriften von Heinrich von Sybel und Julius Ficker zur Deutschen Kaiserpolitik des Mittelalters*, ed. Friedrich Schneider (Innsbruck: Universitäts-Verlag, 1943), 1–18.
- Paul E. Szarmach, 'The (Sub-) Genre of The Battle of Maldon', in *The Battle of Maldon: Fiction and Fact*, ed. Janet Cooper (London-Rio Grande: Hambledon Press, 1993), 43–61.
- Michał T. Szczepański, 'Proroctwo i obietnica.: Nadprzyrodzone przesłanki władzy Ottonów w ujęciu Hrotsvit z Gandersheim', in *Christianitas romana: studia ofiarowane profesorowi Romanowi Michałowskiemu*, ed. Krzysztof Skwirczynski (Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 2009), 104–19.

- Gerd Tellenbach, *The Western Church in Western Europe from the Tenth to the Early Twelfth Century* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000).
- J. A. Thompson, *The Book of Jeremiah* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980).
- James Westfall Thompson, *A History of Historical Writing*, 2 (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1942).
- David E. Thornton, 'Edgar and the Eight Kings, AD 973: Textus et Dramatis Personae', *EME* 10, no. 1 (26 February 2003): 49–79.
- Alfred Thoss, 'Die Umsiedlung der Volksdeutschen aus Bessarabien, der Bukowina und der Dobrudscha', *ZFG XVIII* (1941): 164–67.
- Alfred Thoss, 'Die Umsiedlungen und Optionen im Rahmen der Neuordnung Europas', *ZFG XVIII* (1941): 125–36.
- Alfred Thoss, *Heinrich I (919-936): der Gründer des Ersten Deutschen Volksreiches* (Goslar: Blut und Boden, 1936).
- Alfred Thoss, *Heinrich I (919-936): der Gründer des Ersten Deutschen Volksreiches* (Berlin: C. V. Engelhard, 1943).
- Alfred Thoss, *Heimkehr der Volksdeutschen*, Schriftenreihe der NSDAP. Gruppe III, Volkheit und Glaube 14 (Berlin: F. Eher, Nachfolger, 1941).
- Alfred Thoss, *Waffen-SS im Kampf vor Leningrad*, Kriegsbücherei der Deutschen Jugend 151, (Berlin: Steiniger, 1942).
- Alfred Thoss and Emil Hoffmann, *Der vierte Treck, Leistung und Heimkehr der Deutschen Aus Bessarabien*, Volksdeutsche Heimkehr 7 (Berlin-Leipzig: Nibelungen Verlag, 1941).
- Michał Tomaszek, *Klasztor i jego dobroczyńcy: średniowieczna narracja o opactwie Brauweiler i rodzie królowej Rychezy*, (Kraków: Avalon, 2007).
- Luca Tosi, *Storia cronologica di Vignola ad uso delle scuole* (Vignola: Tipografia di Antoni Bizzarri, 1872).
- Arnold Toynbee, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus and His World* (London-New York: OUP, 1973).
- Dušan Třeštík, *Počátky Přemyslovců. Vstup Čechů do dějin (530-935)* (Praha: Academia, 1981).
- Ralph Trost, *Eine gänzlich zerstörte Stadt: Nationalsozialismus, Krieg und Kriegsende in Xanten* (Münster-New York: Waxmann, 2004).
- Jean A. Truax, 'From Bede to Orderic Vitalis: Changing Perspectives on Women in the Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman Churches', *HSJ* 3 (1991): 35–51.
- Marta Tycner-Wolicka, *Opowieść o wizerunku z Edessy: cesarz Konstantyn Porfirogeneta i nieuczyniony ręką wizerunek Chrystusa* (Kraków: Avalon, 2009).
- Victor Morris Udwin, *Between Two Armies: The Place of the Duel in Epic Culture*, Davis Medieval Texts and Studies 10 (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 1999).
- Mathilde Uhlirz, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reiches unter Otto II. und Otto III.*, 2 (Berlin: Duncker&Humblot, 1954).
- Walter Ullmann, *Principles of Government and Politics in the Middle Ages* (London: Methuen, 1961).
- Walter Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages a Study in the Ideological Relation of Clerical to Lay Power* (London: Methuen, 1965).
- Robert Urbański, *Tartarorum Gens Brutalis: Trzynastowieczne najazdy mongolskie w literaturze polskiego średniowiecza na porównawczym tle piśmiennictwa łacińskiego antyku i wieków średnich*, Studia Staropolskie Ser. Nova, 15 = 71 (Warszawa: Instytut Badań Literackich PAN: Pro Cultura Litteraria, 2007).
- Raymond Van Dam, *Remembering Constantine at the Milvian Bridge* (New York: CUP, 2011).
- Raymond Van Dam, *Saints and Their Miracles in Late Antique Gaul* (Princeton: PUP, 1993).
- John Van Seters, *The Life of Moses: The Yahwist as Historian in Exodus-Numbers* (Kampen, the Netherlands: Kok Pharos Pub. House, 1994).

- István Vásáry, 'Medieval Theories Concerning the Primordial Homeland of the Hungarians', in *Popoli Delle Stepe: Unni, Avari, Ungari*, Settimane 35, (Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1988), 213–42.
- J.F. Verbruggen, *The Art of Warfare in Western Europe during the Middle Age: From the Eight Century to 1340*, trans. Summer Willard and R. W. Southern (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2002).
- Giacomo Vignodelli, 'Imperial Blood: Liutprand of Cremona and the Carolingian Descent of King Adalbert of Italy' (International Medieval Congress, Leeds, 2014).
- Gustavo Vinay, *Alto Medioevo Latino: Conversazioni e no* (Napoli: Guida Editori, 1978).
- Hanna Vollrath-Reichelt, *Königsgedanke und Königtum bei den Angelsachsen bis zur mitte des 9. Jahrhunderts*, Kölner Historische Abhandlungen 19 (Köln: Böhlau, 1971).
- Kurt Vowinckel, '... ein zweiter Napoleon?', *ZFG XVIII* (1941): 371–76.
- Stephen L. Wailes, *Spirituality and Politics in the Works of Hrotsvit of Gandersheim* (Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 2006).
- Stephen L. Wailes, 'The Sacred Stories in Verse', in *A Companion to Hrotsvit of Gandersheim* (Fl. 960): *Contextual and Interpretive Approaches*, ed. Phyllis Rugg Brown and Stephen L. Wailes, BCCT 34 (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2012), 85–120.
- Georg Waitz, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter König Heinrich I*, Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter dem sächsischen Hause 1 (Berlin: Duncker&Humblot, 1837).
- Georg Waitz, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter König Heinrich I* (Berlin: Duncker&Humblot, 1863).
- Georg Waitz, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter König Heinrich I* (Leipzig: Duncker&Humblot, 1885).
- Peter Walther, ed., *Musen und Grazien in der Mark: 750 Jahre Literatur in Brandenburg*, 2 (Ein historisches Schriftstellerlexikon) (Berlin: Lukas, 2002).
- Donald J. Ward, 'The Threefold Death: An Indo-European Trifunctional Sacrifice?', in *Myth and Law among the Indo-Europeans; Studies in Indo-European Comparative Mythology*, ed. Jaan Puhvel, Publications of the UCLA Center for the Study of Comparative Folklore and Mythology, 1 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970), 123–42.
- David A. Warner, 'Reading Ottonian History: The Sonderweg and Other Myths', in *Challenging the Boundaries of Medieval History: The Legacy of Timothy Reuter*, ed. Patricia Skinner (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009), 81–114.
- David A. Warner, 'Saints, Pagans, War and Rulership in Ottonian Germany', in *Plentitude of Power: The Doctrine and Exercise of Authority in the Middle Ages Essays in Memory of Robert Louis Benson*, ed. Robert Charles Figueira (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 11–35.
- Dominik Waßenhoven, 'The Role of Bishops in Anglo-Saxon Succession Struggles, 955 x 978', in *Leaders of the Anglo-Saxon church: from Bede to Stigand*, ed. Alexander R. Rumble (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2012), 97–107.
- Wolfgang Weber, 'Historiographie und Mythographie. Oder: Wie kann und soll der Historiker mit Mythen umgehen?', in *Mythenmächte – Mythen als Argument*, ed. Wolfgang Schmale and Anette Völker-Rasor (Berlin: Berlin Verlag, 1998), 65–87.
- Björn Weiler, 'Crown-giving and King-making in the West, C. 1000 – C. 1250', *Viator* 41 (2010): 54–88.
- Björn Weiler, 'The Rex Renitens and the Medieval Ideal of Kingship, C. 900 – C. 1250', *Viator* 31 (2000): 1–42.
- Stefan Weinfurter, 'Kaiserin Adelheid und das ottonische Kaisertum', *FMSt* 33 (1999): 1–19.
- Max Weinreich, *Hitler's Professors: The Part of Scholarship in Germany's Crimes against the Jewish People* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999).

- Karl Ferdinand Werner, 'Die Legitimität der Kapetinger und die Entstehung des *Reditus Regni Francorum ad stirpem Karoli*', *Die Welt Als Geschichte* 12 (1952): 203–25.
- Karl Ferdinand Werner, 'On Some Examples of the National-Socialist View of History', *JCH* 3, no. 2 (1968): 193–206.
- Gordon Whatley, 'The Figure of Constantine the Great in Cynewulf's "Elene"', *Traditio* 37 (1 January 1981): 161–202.
- Dorothy Whitelock, 'William of Malmesbury on the Works of King Alfred', in *Medieval Literature and Civilization: Studies in Memory of G. N. Garmonsway*, ed. Derek Albert Pearsall and R. A. Waldron (London: Athlone Press, 1969), 78–93.
- Chris Wickham, *Early Medieval Italy: Central Power and Local Society, 400–1000*, New Studies in Medieval History (London: Macmillan, 1981).
- Ann Williams, 'Some Notes and Considerations on Problems Connected with the English Royal Succession, 860–1066', in *Proceedings of the Battle Conference on Anglo-Norman Studies*, 1, ed. Reginald Allen Brown (Woodbridge: Boydell Press; Rowman and Littlefield, 1979), 144–67, 225–33.
- Simon John Williams, 'The Transmission and Reception of Historiography in the Tenth Century: An Analysis of Liudprand of Cremona's *Antapodosis*' (unpublished Ph.D., University of Liverpool, 2013).
- Katharina M. Wilson, ed., *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: Rara Avis in Saxonia?: A Collection of Essays*, Medieval and Renaissance Monograph Series 7 (Ann Arbor: Medieval and Renaissance Collegium, 1987).
- Przemysław Wiszewski, *Domus Boleslai: Values and Social Identity in Dynastic Traditions of Medieval Poland (C. 966–1138)*, trans. Paul Barford, East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 450–1450 9 (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2010).
- Susanne Wittekind, 'Die Makkabäer als Vorbild des geistlichen Kampfes. Eine kunst-historische Deutung des Leidener Makkabäer-Codex Perizoni L 17', *FMSt* 37 (2003): 47–71.
- Helge Wittmann, *Im Schatten der Landgrafen: Studien zur adeligen Herrschaftsbildung im spätmittelalterlichen Thüringen* (Köln: Böhlau, 2008).
- Armin Wolf, *Die Entstehung des Kurfürstenkollegs 1198–1298: Zur 700-jährigen Wiederkehr der Ersten Vereinigung der Sieben Kurfürsten*, Historisches Seminar n.F. 11 (Idstein: Schulz-Kirchner, 1998).
- Armin Wolf, 'Von den Königswahlen zum Kurfürstenkolleg. Bilddenkmale als unerkannte Dokumente der Verfassungsgeschichte', in *Wahlen und Wählen im Mittelalter*, ed. Reinhard Schneider and Harald Zimmermann, VuF 37 (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1990), 13–78.
- Gunther Wolf, 'König Heinrichs I. Romzugsplan 935/936', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 103 (1992): 33–45.
- Gunther Wolf, 'Über die Hintergründe der Erhebung Liudolfs von Schwaben', in *Otto der Große*, ed. Harald Zimmermann, WdF 450 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1976), 56–69.
- Kenneth Baxter Wolf, *Conquerors and Chroniclers of Early Medieval Spain* (Liverpool: LUP, 1999).
- Herwig Wolfram, *Conrad II, 990–1039: Emperor of Three Kingdoms* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006).
- Gordon Wolnik, *Mittelalter und NS-Propaganda: Mittelalterbilder in den Print-, Ton- und Bildmedien des Dritten Reiches*, Geschichte 60 (Münster: Lit, 2004).
- Ian N. Wood, 'Giovardi, MS Verolensis 1, Arichis and Mercurius', in *Zwischen Niederschrift und Wiederschrift: Hagiographie und Historiographie im Spannungsfeld von Kompendienüberlieferung und Editionstechnik*, ed. Richard Corradini, Maximilian Diesenberger, and Meta Niederkorn-Bruck, Denkschriften / Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 405 (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2010), 197–210.
- Susan Wood, *The Proprietary Church in the Medieval West* (Oxford-New York: OUP, 2006).

- Barbara Yorke, 'Æthelwold and the Politics of the Tenth Century', in *Bishop Æthelwold: His Career and Influence*, ed. Barbara Yorke (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1997), 65–88.
- Johannes Zechner, 'Politicized Timber: The German Forest and the Nature of the Nation 1800-1945', *The Brock Review* 11, no. 2 (2011): 19–32.
- Herbert Zielinski, "Erben der Karolinger". Zu den Anfängen der Italienpolitik Ottos des Großen und zum Werk Frithjof Sielaffs', in *De Litteris, Manuscriptis, Inscriptionibus--: Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Walter Koch*, ed. Theo Kölzer (Wien: Böhlau, 2007), 755–88.
- Benedykt Zientara, "Teutones" i "Regnum Teutonicum". Do dyskusji nad początkami państwa i narodu niemieckiego', in *Mente et Litteris: O kulturze i społeczeństwie wieków średnich*, ed. Helena Chłopocka, Historia – Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu 117 (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 1984), 75–84.
- Harald Zimmermann, *Das dunkle Jahrhundert. Ein historisches Porträt* (Graz: Styria, 1971).
- Harald Zimmermann, 'Die Anfänge des Deutschen Reiches unter Otto Dem Großen nach Thomas Ebdorfer', in *Festschrift Friedrich Hausmann*, ed. Herwig Ebner (Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1977), 603–14.
- Harald Zimmermann, 'Papstabsetzungen des Mittelalters', *MIÖG* 72 (1964): 74–109.
- Juan Carlos Iglesias Zoido, 'The Battle Exhortation in Ancient Rhetoric', *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 25, no. 2 (1 May 2007): 141–58.
- Thomas Zotz, 'Amicitia und Discordia. Zu einer Neuerscheinung über das Verhältnis von Königtum und Adel in frühottonischer Zeit', *Francia* 16, no. 1 (1989): 169–75.
- Thomas Zotz, 'Est in Alsacie partibus castellum Brisicau. Breisach als Schauplatz der politischen Geschichte im 10. Jahrhundert', *Zeitschrift des Breisgau-Geschichtsvereins. Schau-Ins-Land* 111 (1992): 9–23.
- Thomas Zotz, 'Kingship and Palaces in the Ottonian Realm and in the Kingdom of England', in *England and the Continent in the Tenth Century: Studies in Honour of Wilhelm Levison (1876-1947)*, ed. Wilhelm Levison et al. (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), 311–30.
- Thomas Zotz, 'König Otto I., Graf Guntram und Breisach', *ZGO* 137 / NF 98 (1989): 64–77.
- Thomas Zotz, 'Wie der Typ des Allein-Herrschers (monarchus) durchgesetzt wurde', in *Die Macht des Königs: Herrschaft in Europa vom Frühmittelalter bis in die Neuzeit*, ed. Bernhard Jussen (München: Beck, 2005), 90–105.
- Paweł Żmudski, *Władca i wojownicy: narracje o wodzach, drużynie i wojnach w najdawniejszej historiografii polski i rusi*, Monografie Fundacji Na Rzecz Nauki Polskiej (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2009).

Webpages

- Najbarowski and Sadaj, 'Numery Członków SS' = Łukasz Najbarowski and Waldemar Sadaj, 'Numery Członków SS Od 153 000 Do 153 999', n.d., <http://www.dws-xip.pl/reich/biografie/numery/numer153.html> (seen 30 November 2017).
- 'Thüringer Literaturrat' = Thüringer Literaturrat, n.d., <http://www.thueringer-literaturrat.de/index.php?pageid=14&unitid=5090&PHPSESSID=oqpjni6jdhrlkrjv04907p790> (seen 30 November 2017).
- Jarrett, 'Chasing a Fake Chronicler' = Jonathan Jarrett, 'Chasing a Fake Chronicler: "Eutrand" of Toledo', *A Corner of Tenth-Century Europe*, 12 July 2014, <https://tenthmedieval.wordpress.com/2014/07/12/chasing-a-fake-chronicler-eutrand-of-toledo/> (seen 30 November 2017).

Index

- Aaron, Prophet 154, 230
 Abd ar-Rahman III, Caliph of Córdoba 19, 24, 26
 Abel, son of Adam 134-35
 Abraham, Bishop of Freising 22, 27
 Abraham, Patriarch 137, 228
 Adalbert, Archbishop of Magdeburg 9, 11, 29, 47,
 49, 57-59, 64-65, 74, 77, 87, 89, 102, 128, 142,
 144-45, 158, 160, 162-63, 165, 169-70, 174, 186,
 190-91, 209-10
 Adalbert, Margrave of Tuscany 51-52
 Adalbert, Saint Bishop of Prague 92-93
 Adalbert, son of Berengar II 78, 97
 Adalbert Babenberg, *Comes* 50, 198
 Adelheid, Queen of Italy and later of East
 Francia and Empress 22, 97, 132
 Adémar of Chabannes, chronicler 226
 Aelius Donatus, Roman grammarian 177
 Aeneas, Trojan Hero 95-96
 Æthelred II the Unready, King of the English 131
 Æthelstan, King of the English 19, 223
 Afra, Martyr Saint 77, 79
 Agina, soldier of Henry *Dux* of Bavaria 157, 160
 Agobard, Archbishop of Lyon 208
 Alahis, King of the Lombards 151
 Alberic, son of Marosia 86
 Alberic of Trois-Fontaines, chronicler 217
 Albert the Fair, Saxon 158
 Alcuin of York, scholar 55
 Alexander the Great, King of Macedonia 197, 200
 Alexius, Bohemian *Comes* 173
 Gerd Althoff 14, 18, 32, 44, 62, 65, 82-83, 98-100,
 104-05, 122-23, 126, 129, 141, 149-50, 155, 161,
 165, 167, 170, 177, 182, 192, 214, 220, 234
 Ambrose, Bishop of Milan 202, 226
 Annalista Saxo, chronicler 29, 31, 62, 78, 232
 Aregius, Bishop of Nîmes 57
 Arichis II, Lombard prince 59
 Arminius (Herman), Germanic leader 220
 Arnulf, *Dux* of Bavaria 47, 62-64, 68-69, 77-79,
 102-03, 110, 112-18, 121-23, 125-26, 129, 134, 142,
 145, 195, 207, 209
 Arnulf of Carinthia, Emperor 56, 70, 88, 110, 118,
 133, 179, 197, 200, 226
 Arthur, Mythic King 127
 Attila, ruler of the Huns 216
 Atto, Bishop of Vercelli 28
 Audradus Modicus, scholar 135
 Augustine of Hippo, Saint 139, 152, 171, 208
 Avitus of Sarlat, Saint 168
- David S. Bachrach 62, 141
 Barbara Baert 225
 Sverre Bagge 159
 Roland Barthes 15
 Basileios the Nothos, *parakoimomenos* 20
- Baturich, Bishop of Regensburg 156-57
 Matthias Becher 31
 Josef Becker 21, 23
 Bede Venerabilis, scholar 126
 Bedivere, knight in Arthurian legend 127
 Benedict V, Pope 167
 Beorhtric, King of Wessex 138
 Berengar I, King of Italy 52-54, 56, 59, 62, 112,
 169, 198-99, 206
 Berengar II, King of Italy 19-20, 22, 26, 28, 70, 78,
 86, 97, 152, 184-85, 189, 203
 Bernard I, *Dux* of Saxony 126
 Berno of Reichenau, Abbot 78
 Walter Berschin 78-79
 Berta, Burchard of Swabia's daughter, wife of
 Rudolph of Burgundy 233
 Bertha (Eudochia), illegitimate daughter of
 Hugh of Arles, wife of Romanos II 20
 Berthold, *Dux* of Bavaria 129, 186, 192
 Birger Brosa (Birgr), jarl 73
 Otto von Bismarck 41
 John Bliese 204
 Karen Blough 228
 Boethius (Anicius Manlius Severinus
 Boethius), scholar 21, 68, 202
 Michail Bojcov 126
 Boleslav Chrobry, King of Poland 208, 223
 Boniface, Saint Archbishop of Mainz 82
 Egon Boshof 70
 Boson, King of Provence 56
 François Bougard 21, 24, 134
 Christopher Bowlus 205
 Anastasia Brakhman 27-28
 Bretislav II, *Dux* of Bohemia 173-74
 Bruning, Saxon 141-43, 145, 147-50
 Bruno, Archbishop of Cologne 94, 168
 Bruno of Querfurt, Bishop 223
 Carlrichard Brühl 93, 118-19
 Philippe Buc 24, 26-27, 29, 53-54, 62, 67, 86
 Max Buchner 40
 Burchard, Bishop of Würzburg 54
 Burchard, *Dux* of Swabia 47, 63, 78, 103, 109-10,
 115-17, 121-23, 233
 Burchard III, *Dux* of Swabia 127
 Burchard, Saxon Count 144
 Johannes Burkhardt 18
 Johannes Bühler 97
 Byrhtferth of Ramsey, scholar 60
- Caesarius of Heisterbach, scholar 156
 Cain, son of Adam 134-36
 Joseph Campbell 15
 Alexander Cartellieri 32, 36, 63, 88, 115, 146, 160,
 164, 181, 191, 200, 211-12, 219, 221, 233
 Friedrich Castelle 152

- Cathuulf, scholar 230
- Charlemagne, Emperor 11, 18, 41, 50, 59, 66, 68, 82, 87-89, 93, 97, 100, 102-04, 109-10, 138, 147, 153, 155, 168, 195, 200, 202-03, 205, 209, 223, 226, 230
- Charles II the Bald, Emperor 92, 135, 140, 152, 179, 207
- Charles III the Fat, Emperor 53, 88, 226
- Charles III the Simple, King of West Francia 49, 54, 100-01, 110, 119-20, 123, 232
- Charles V, King of France 154
- Charles VIII, King of France 154
- Charles Martel, Mayor of the Palace 109, 179
- Paolo Chiesa 9, 21-22, 52, 134, 177
- Childebert II, King of Austrasia 60
- Childeric III, King of Francia 54, 109
- Eric Christiansen 69
- Neil Christie 228
- Christopher Lekapenos, son of Romanos I Lekapenos 69
- Chur (Hur), Moses' companion 154
- Cicero (Marcus Tullius Cicero), Roman politician 183
- Enzo Colonna 95-96, 113
- Conrad, accuser of Liutgard 144
- Conrad I, *Dux* of Bohemia 136
- Conrad I, *Dux* of Swabia 126
- Conrad I, King of East Francia 15, 18, 42, 45, 47-58, 60-66, 68, 70, 72-73, 75-76, 79-82, 100, 103, 109-13, 115-16, 118-20, 122-23, 144, 201, 213, 219, 228, 237-38
- Conrad II, Emperor 67, 93, 233
- Conrad the Red, *Dux* of Lotharingia 127, 186
- Conrad the Wise (Kurzbold), *Comes* of Niederlahngau 140, 145, 147, 151, 171, 173, 176, 180-82
- Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, Emperor 20, 23, 69, 187-89, 231
- Constantine Lekapenos, son of Romanos I Lekapenos 187-88
- Constantine the Great, Emperor 131, 223, 225, 227, 229-34
- Cornelius Nepos, biographer 21
- Cosmas of Prague, chronicler 92-3, 136, 173
- Cú Chulainn (Cuchulain), Irish mythological hero 153
- Cunincpert, King of Lombards 152
- David, Biblical King 26, 97, 134, 171, 176, 178, 229-30
- Josef Deér 226
- Joseph Depoin 180
- Diabolinus *see* Michael Diabolinus
- Dido, Queen of Carthage 95
- Dietrich, Bishop of Metz 23
- Dionysius (Saint Denis), Martyr Saint 224
- Hellmut Diwald 32, 43, 64-65, 82, 121-22, 213-14, 235
- Dominic, chaplain 26
- Domninus of Fidenza, Martyr Saint 52
- Wilhelm Dönniges 35
- Dudo of Saint-Quentin, chronicler 28, 69, 94
- Georges Dumézil 175
- Ernst Dümmler 36, 53, 100, 129, 141, 145-48, 160, 164, 169, 180, 182, 190, 233
- Eadburh, Queen of Wessex 138
- Eadmer of Canterbury, scholar 131
- Eberhard, *Dux* of Bavaria 129
- Eberhard III, *Dux* of Franconia 47-50, 56, 61-65, 68, 71, 83, 101, 109-10, 119, 125-26, 137-52, 161-62, 164-65, 171-78, 180-82, 233-35
- Ecgrifith (Egfrid), King of Mercia 76
- Edgar the Peaceful, King of England 60, 91-92, 94, 99-100, 131
- Edith, daughter of Edward the Elder and Ælflæd, wife of Otto I 56, 90-91, 132, 169-70
- Edmund the Martyr, King of East Anglia 168
- Edward the Confessor, King of England 47
- Edward the Martyr, King of English 131
- Edwin, King of Deira and Bernicia 126
- Einhard, chronicler 54, 59, 68, 138
- Ekkehard IV, monk in St. Gallen 61, 63, 144, 176
- Ekkehard of Aura, chronicler 7, 62
- Terje Emberland 39
- Emma, wife of Richard of Fresnel 138
- Engelbert (Angelbert), poet 135, 140
- Ermoldus Nigellus, poet 59, 97
- Carl Erdmann 81
- Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea 226, 230
- Robert Evans 230
- Fastrada, Queen, wife of Charlemagne 138
- Heinrich Fichtenau 138
- Karol Fiedor 38
- Flambert, nobleman from Verona, killer of Berengar I 52-53
- Josef Fleckenstein 220
- Flodoard of Reims, chronicler 82, 180
- Wendelin Foerster 127
- Formosus, Pope 136
- Michael Frase 29
- Frederick, Archbishop of Mainz 161-65, 182-83, 186, 189-92
- Frederick II, Emperor 16
- Frederick II the Great, King of Prussia 37
- Frederick Wilhelm I, King in Prussia 37
- Johannes Fried 14, 47-49, 58-59, 62, 90
- Heinz-Werner Friese 41
- Frutolf of Michelsberg, chronicler 12, 14, 30-31, 61-62, 75, 78, 90, 114-15, 143-44, 159, 164, 169, 179-80, 189-90, 208, 232-33, 238
- Fulrad, Abbot of St. Denis 54
- Gallus Anonymous, chronicler 17, 223
- Klaus Gamber 157
- Gareth, knight in Arthurian legend 127
- Garibald, King of the Longobards 131

- Claudia Garnier 167
 Mary Garrison 226, 230
 Patrick J. Geary 78
 Gebehardus, Bishop of Augsburg 78-79
 Gebhard son of Udo Count of Wetterau 147
 Gerberga, Henry I's daughter 127, 138, 174, 183, 190-91, 193
 Gerhard, Count of Alsace 60
 Gerhard of Augsburg, clergyman 76-79
 Gero I, Margrave 125, 128, 145, 148
 Wolfgang Giese 32, 40, 44, 48, 65, 77, 79, 83, 88, 123, 133, 139, 145, 147, 214, 235
 Friedrich Wilhelm von Giesebrecht 33
 Mario Giovini 21
 Giselbert, *Dux* of Lotharingia 47, 91, 109-11, 119, 125-26, 137-40, 142-45, 147-49, 151-52, 157-58, 165, 171-78, 180-83, 212
 Godfrey of Viterbo, chronicler 31
 Goliath, Biblical hero 176
 Michael Grant 17
 Gregory II, Pope 58
 Gregory, Bishop of Tours 60, 155, 175
 Arthur Greiser 38
 Grimoald, King of the Longobards 131
 Jacob Grimm 33, 141, 146
 Wilhelm Grimm 33
 Gumpold, Bishop of Mantua 168
 Guntram, *Comes* 166, 170
 Guntram, King of Orleans 60
 Heinrich Günter 32, 42, 82, 98-99, 104, 129, 148, 161, 165, 170, 182, 191-92, 234

 Hadding, legendary King of Denmark 175
 Frank Hadler 18
 Hannibal Barca, Carthaginian general 25
 Harlungen, children of Diether (Theoderic the Great) 144
 Harold II Godwinson, King of England 47, 156
 Hartmut Hoffmann 22
 Hartvik, chronicler 57
 Hasdrubal Barca, Carthaginian general 25
 Hatheburg, Henry I first wife 128
 Hatto, Archbishop of Mainz 50, 80
 Karl Hauck 29, 101, 231
 Hedwig, daughter of Henry I *Dux* of Bavaria 127
 Hermann Heimpel 40
 Helena, mother of Constantine the Great 225-26, 234
 Helwise, Countess of Evreux 138
 Henry I, King of East Francia 11-12, 14-15, 18, 31, 35, 37-40, 43-45, 47-54, 57-66, 68-83, 85-91, 94-96, 97, 99-105, 107, 109-24, 127, 129, 131, 134, 136, 144-45, 149, 159, 164, 169, 176, 180, 195, 197, 199, 201-21, 224, 227-28, 232-35, 238
 Henry II, Emperor 42, 60, 93-94, 132, 223
 Henry III, Emperor 153
 Henry IV Emperor 30, 143
 Henry V, Emperor, 126

 Henry I, *Dux* of Bavaria 90, 94-95, 114, 125-40, 142-43, 145-46, 148-53, 157-58, 160-61, 163, 165, 176, 182-87, 190-93
 Henry II, *Dux* of Bavaria 126
 Henry III, *Dux* of Carinthia 126
 Henry II the Pious, *Dux* of Silesia 218
 Henry of Huntingdon, chronicler 28
 Heraclius (Flavius Heracles Augustus), Emperor 225
 Heriger, Archbishop of Mainz 80, 103
 Hermann I, *Dux* of Swabia 103, 123, 126, 140, 147, 151, 174, 180-81, 184, 186
 Hermann Billung, Margrave 130
 Hildebert, Archbishop of Mainz 87, 104
 Hildebrand, Italian *Comes* 51
 Himerius, Saint Bishop of Amelia 23
 Heinrich Himmler 37, 39, 70, 117, 218
 Hincmar, Archbishop of Reims 56, 111, 179, 208
 Paul von Hindenburg 38
 Adolf Hitler 36-37, 39-41, 45, 102, 120-21, 219
 Adolf Hofmeister 12, 229
 Heinrich Holtzmann 41
 Robert Holtzmann 12, 32, 40-42, 59, 64, 81, 98, 103-05, 121, 129, 147-48, 160, 164, 169-70, 181, 191-92, 200, 213, 218, 229, 234-35
 Hrotsvit of Gandersheim, poetess 11, 26, 29-30, 74, 125-26, 128, 134, 137, 144, 162, 174, 178-79, 186, 191-93
 Hans-Jürgen Hube 17
 Hugh, son of Maginfred, *Comes* of Milan 52
 Hugh Capet, King of the Franks 223
 Hugh of Arles, King of Italy 19-20, 22, 69, 85-86, 93, 97, 184-85, 189
 Hunding, legendary King of the Sweden 175
 Wolfgang Huschner 22

 Isabel of Conches, wife of Ralph (Raoul) II of Tosny, seigneur de Conches-en-Ouche 138
 Isidore, Archbishop of Seville 59, 200

 James the Greater, Apostle 155-56, 159, 168
 Jeremiah, prophet 200-01
 Jerome, scholar 175
 Jesus Christ 52, 60, 113, 136-38, 151, 166, 179, 186, 203, 224, 227-28, 231-33, 235
 Jezebel, Biblical Queen 26, 138
 John of Worcester, chronicler 99
 John VIII, Pope 135
 Eric John 92
 Jordanes, chronicler 201
 Josephus Flavius, scholar 200
 Joshua, Biblical figure 153, 229
 Judah Maccabee, Jewish priest 153, 163
 Judas Iscariot, Apostle 52, 135-36
 Julian, Archbishop of Toledo 57, 59-60, 67
 Julius Caesar (Gaius Julius Caesar), Roman politician 25, 134, 151, 227

Juvenal (Decimus Iunius Iuvenalis), poet 198

Kay, knight in Arthurian legend 127

Hermann Kamp 145

Ernst Kantorowicz 92-93

Ernst Karpf 23, 57, 71, 83, 96

Michael Kater 39

Hagen Keller 32, 77, 88, 90, 141, 163, 209

Paul Wilhelm von Keppler 42

Hans-Walter Klewitz 93

Ludger Körntgen 13, 55, 155, 166, 232

Rudolf Köpke 32, 35-36, 100, 129, 141, 145-48, 160, 164, 169, 180, 182, 190, 233

Ladislav I, *Dux* of Bohemia 126

Ladislav I, Saint King of Hungary 72, 168

Lambert, King of Italy 51-53, 56, 70, 113

Karl Lamprecht 36

Michael Lapidge 28, 60

Latinus, mythological hero 95

Johannes Laudage 32, 44, 105, 150, 161, 165, 170, 182, 193, 234

Jay T. Lees 74, 134, 178

Noel Lenski 230

Leo, Bishop of Vercelli 94

Leo III, Pope 88, 130, 231

Leo VIII, Pope 167

Leo the Grammaticus, chronicler 188

Claude Levi-Strauss 17

Leviathan, Biblical monster 136

Conrad Leyser 203

Karl Leyser 20, 27, 128, 145, 169, 210

Felice Lifshitz 94

Martin Lintzel 12, 29, 170, 205, 218-19

Lionesse, heroine in Arthurian legend 127

Liudolf, Otto I's son 132-33, 183, 209

Liudolf F, scribe 22

Liudprand of Cremona, chronicler 9, 11-15, 18-30, 45, 47, 51-54, 57-59, 61-65, 68-69, 74, 77, 80-81, 83, 85-91, 93-97, 100, 102, 105, 107, 108-17, 121-25, 127-40, 142-44, 146, 148-57, 159-65, 167-70, 172, 174-93, 195-209, 211-15, 219, 221, 223-36, 237-38

Liutgard, Otto Magnus' sister 56

Liutgard, Otto I and Edith's daughter 56, 144

Liutprand, Lombard King 58

Carl Loewe 44

Christian Lohmer 30

Longinus, Saint Roman soldier 223, 226, 235

Chris Lorenz 18

Lot, Patriarch 137

Lothar II, King of Lotharingia 92

Lothar II, King of Italy 20, 85, 93, 97, 184, 189

Lothar I, Emperor 135, 140, 152, 179, 183-84

Louis II, Emperor 59

Louis III the Younger, King of Bavaria and Saxony 56, 135

Louis IV d'Outremer, King of West Francia 88, 103-04, 146-50, 165, 174, 179-80, 183, 190-92

Louis the Blind, King of Provence 112

Louis the Child, King of East Francia 51, 72, 79, 81, 112, 133, 197-98, 206

Louis the German, King of East Francia 56, 110, 135, 156-57, 179, 207-08

Louis the Pious, Emperor 54, 59, 97, 100, 135, 179, 183-84

Lucan, knight in Arthurian legend 127

Lucius Sergius Catilina, Roman politician 183

Franz Lüdtkke 32, 37-38, 40-42, 63, 79-80, 98-99, 115-16, 118-20, 123, 195, 210, 212, 218, 234

Rudolf Lüttich 198

Łewond (Lewond/Ghewond), chronicler 231-32

Simon MacLean 226

Maginfred, *Comes* of Milan 51-52

Magnus V Erlingsson, King of Norway 73

Maincia, soldier, killer of Thankmar 158, 160

Werner Maleczek 97

Manasses, Bishop of Arles 86, 136

Mark, Apostle 86

Marozia, senatrix 70, 85-86, 138

Martianus Capella (Martianus Minneus Felix Capella), scholar 202

Martin, Saint Bishop of Tours 155

Mathilda, Queen of East Francia 22, 48, 66, 91, 94, 129, 138, 191-92

Mathilda, Otto I's daughter 29

Matthew, Apostle 166, 169

Maurice, Saint commander of Theban Legion 223, 235

Maxentius (Marcus Aurelius Valerius Maxentius Augustus), Emperor 230

Maximilian II, King of Bavaria 35, 71

Karl May 219

Hans Eberhard Mayer 59

Rosamund McKitterick 13

William McNeill 18

Christel Meier 177

Mercurius Philopator, Martyr Saint 229

Mesco, *Dux* of Poland 57

Michael Diabolinus 187-88

Milo, *Comes* of Verona 189

Mircea Eliade 15-16

Moses, Biblical hero 153-55, 161, 223, 229-32

Herfried Münkler 17

Napoleon I, Emperor of the French 212

Lubor Niederle 227

Nithard, chronicler 13, 152, 183

Notker the Stammler, poet 110, 155

Nun, Biblical figure 229

Christoph Obermüller 118

Jörg Oberste 224

Odo, King of Francia 49, 56

Offa, King of Mercia 49, 76

Orderic Vitalis, chronicler 138, 172-73

- Origen, scholar 231
 Oswald, King of Northumbria 157
 Otto I, King of East Francia, Emperor 11-15,
 20-24, 27-32, 35, 37, 40-42, 44-45, 48-50,
 56, 58, 71, 74, 77-78, 85-105, 107, 112, 114, 125,
 127-34, 137-52, 154-74, 176-93, 195-96, 207,
 214-18, 220, 223-25, 227-29, 231-35, 237
 Otto II, King of East Francia, Emperor 29, 48,
 58, 75, 90-92, 104-05, 132
 Otto III, King of East Francia, Emperor 89,
 93-94, 101, 126, 208
 Otto, Bishop of Bamberg 227
 Otto, Bishop of Freising 31, 78
 Otto, *Dux* of Lotharingia 174
 Otto, Liudolf's son 133
 Otto Habsburg 217
 Otto Magnus, *Dux* of Saxony 56, 72-73, 79-81, 83

 Paul (Flavius Paulus), *Dux* 57, 59-60, 68-69
 Paul the Deacon, chronicler 17, 131, 152, 176
 Pepin the Short, King of the Franks 54-55, 75,
 230
 Peter, Apostle 58, 77, 82, 86, 130, 228
 Piast the Plowman, ancestor of Piast dynasty 17
 Pompey (Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus), Roman
 general 25
 Titus Pomponius Atticus (Quintus Caecilius
 Pomponianus), friend of Cicero 21
 Hedwig Potthast 39
 Günter Prinzing 188
 Procopius of Caesarea, scholar 200

 Werner Radig 37
 Radslav, *Dux* of Kouřim 156
 Ralph (Raoul) II of Tosny, seigneur de Conches-
 en-Ouche 138
 Leopold von Ranke 15, 31-36, 81-82, 117
 Rather, Bishop of Verona 21, 27-28, 167
 Raymund II, *Comes* of Rouergue 189
 Recemund of Elvira (probably Rabi ibn Zaid),
 emmisary of Abd ar-Rahman III 24, 26, 52,
 136
 Regelinde, wife of Burchard II *Dux* of Swabia
 103
 Reginard, *Dux* of Lotharingia 119
 Regino of Prüm, chronicler 9, 11, 29
 Timothy Reuter 100
 Richard I, *Dux* of Normandy 94
 Richard, seigneur de La Ferté-Frênel (of
 Fresnel) 138
 Richard I the Lionheart, King of England 136
 Henry Gerald Richardson 92
 Richer of Reims, chronicler 179
 Ricwin, *Dux* of Lotharingia 174, 192
 Robert I, King of Franks 49
 Robert Curthose, son of William the Conqueror
 66
 Christina La Rocca 22
 Rodolf/Ruddlf, King of Heroli 176

 Roger I of Tosny, seigneur of Conches 173
 Rollo, *Dux* of Normandy 153
 Romanos I Lekapenos, Emperor 20, 69-70,
 187-88
 Romanos II, Emperor 20
 Romuald, *Dux* of Benevento 131
 Alfred Rosenberg 37-38
 Rudolf of Rheinfelden, *Dux* of Swabia 143
 Rudolph II, King of Burgundy 58, 115, 121-23,
 223-24, 227-28, 233-35
 Rufinus of Aquileia, chronicler 226
 Ruodhard, Bishop of Strasburg 163, 165, 192

 Samson, Italian *Comes* 223-24, 228
 Samson of Tottington, abbot 168
 Saul, King of Israel 178
 George Osborne Sayles 15, 92
 Saxo Grammaticus, chronicler 17
 Theodor Schieffer 40
 Percy Ernst Schramm 59, 205, 225
 Walther Schultze 101
 Kerstin Schulmeyer-Ahl 71, 77, 132
 Berent Schwineköper 226
 Scipio Africanus (Publius Cornelius Scipio
 Africanus), Roman general 25
 Sedulius Scottus, scholar 207, 230
 Sergius, Martyr 155
 Sergius II, Pope 59
 Sergius III, Pope 136
 Siegrfid, Margrave (*Comes*) of Merseburg 128,
 143, 145, 147-48, 150
 Andrew W. Small 20
 W. Soldan 151
 Solomon, Biblical King 97, 126
 Fiona Somerset 139
 Paolo Squatriti 27
 Nicholas Staubach 21-22, 28, 167, 207
 Adelheid Steinmann 41
 Stephen II, Pope 230
 Stephen IV, Pope 97
 Stephen VI, Pope 136
 Stephen Lekapenos, son of Romanos I
 Lekapenos 187-88
 Jerzy Strzelczyk 32
 Sverre Sigurdsson (Sverrir), King of Norway 73
 Sviatopolk, *Dux* of Moravia 197
 Swarożyc, Slavic God 223
 Heinrich von Sybel 34, 71
 Świętowit (Svetovid), Slavic God 227

 Tacitus (Publius/Gaius Cornelius Tacitus),
 Roman historian 66
 Tassilo III, *Dux* of Bavaria 230
 Tedbald, Italian warlord 140
 Teophanu, Empress 23
 Terence (Publius Terentius Afer), playwright
 25, 183
 Terentianus Maurus, grammarian 202
 Teuderic, King of Franks 76

- Thankmar, Henry I's son 125-26, 128-30, 142-43, 145-50, 158, 173
- Thegan, chronicler 179
- Theoderic the Great, King of the Ostrogoths and Visigoths 144
- Theodora of Tusculum, Senatrix 138
- Thietmar, Bishop of Merseburg, chronicler 60, 72, 76, 78, 82, 92, 101, 126, 144, 190-92, 211
- Thietmar, Henry's Legate 50-51
- Thomas, Apostle 151, 228
- Thomas Ebendorfer, chronicler 78
- Alfred Thoss 32, 38-40, 42, 63, 80-82, 102, 116-23, 213-14, 233
- Thucydides, Greek historian 204
- Trajan Decius (Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Augustus), Emperor 229
- Udalric, Bishop of Augsburg 77-79, 117
- Udo, Count of Wetterau 140, 145, 147, 151, 171, 174, 180-82, 186
- Franz Unterkircher 157
- Valens (Flavius Julius Valens Augustus), Emperor 175
- Valery (Gualaric/Walaric) of Leuconay, Hermit Saint 153
- Gustavo Vinay 25
- Vincent of Saragossa, Saint Martyr 156
- Virgil (Publius Vergilius Maro), poet 27, 95-96, 114, 134, 137, 198
- Vitus, Saint Martyr 54
- Johann Nepomuk Vogl 44
- Hanna Vollrath-Reichelt 76
- Vratislav II, King of Bohemia 136, 173
- Stephen Wailes 26
- Georg Waitz 31-32, 34-36, 40, 62-63, 78-79, 115, 154, 211, 233
- Wamba, King of the Visigoths 57, 59-60, 67-69, 73, 113
- Björn Weiler 66, 68, 71-74
- Wenceslaus I, Saint *Dux* of Bohemia 156, 168
- Dorothy Whitelock 126
- Wiborada, Saint Martyr 78
- Wichfrid, Archbishop of Cologne 87
- Wichmann I the Elder (Wichmann Billung), Saxon rebel 125, 129
- Wido of Modena, Bishop 189
- Wido, King of Italy 51, 53, 56, 70
- Widukind, *Dux* of Saxons 18, 66
- Widukind of Corvey, chronicler 9, 11, 13, 15, 26, 29, 45, 47, 49-51, 53-54, 57-59, 61-65, 70-77, 79-80, 82-83, 87-94, 96-98, 100, 104-05, 107, 109-11, 114-17, 121, 123-30, 132, 137, 141-43, 145-46, 148-51, 156-65, 170, 174, 178, 180-81, 183, 186, 189-93, 195, 199-200, 205-16, 219, 221, 228-29, 232-34, 237-39
- Wilhelm II, Emperor of Second Reich 216
- Willa, Queen, wife of Berengar II 26, 28, 86, 203
- William, Archbishop of Mainz 29
- William, Count of Évreux 138
- William I, Emperor of Second Reich 146
- William of Malmesbury, chronicler 126
- William of Poitiers, chronicler 153, 156
- William the Conqueror, King of England 153, 156
- Ann Williams 131
- Wincenty of Kielcza, chronicler 57
- Wipo of Burgundy, chronicler 67
- Wirpik of Tengling, wife of Conrad I *Dux* of Bohemia 136
- Przemysław Wiszewski 223-24
- Wodan, Germanic God 55, 233, 235
- Ian N. Wood 229
- Zachary, Pope 54, 230
- Harald Zimmermann 11
- Zwentibold, King of Lotharingia 133